

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

---

All Graduate Theses and Dissertations

Graduate Studies

---

5-1982

## Feminine Development: The Relationship Between Identity Status, Personality and Social Influence Style

Dorris Anne Read  
*Utah State University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Read, Dorris Anne, "Feminine Development: The Relationship Between Identity Status, Personality and Social Influence Style" (1982). *All Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. 5925.  
<https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd/5925>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@usu.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@usu.edu).



FEMININE DEVELOPMENT: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN  
IDENTITY STATUS, PERSONALITY AND SOCIAL  
INFLUENCE STYLE

by

Doris Anne Read

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree

of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

Psychology

Approved:

Utah State University

Logan, Utah

1982





## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to extend my warmest thanks to Dr. Pamela Riley, Dr. Michael Bertoch, and Dr. Walter Borg for their valuable suggestions, critical feedback, and good humor during the design and implementation of this dissertation.

In addition, I wish to thank Kathy Dravage, George Seib, and Ellen Shaub, who persisted as confederates and refused all that candy. And to Laurie Lee, who scored the behavioral observations, collaborated on the revision of the scoring system, and made me smile, I express my heartfelt thanks. Also, I wish to thank Kathy Whitney, who transcribed the audio-tapes, for much more love than money.

I extend special thanks to co-chairman, Dr. William R. Dobson, who provided academic direction, nurturing support, and seasoned wisdom through the dissertation process and my graduate career. His belief in me has been a most special gift.

I am most grateful to co-chairman Dr. Gerald R. Adams, for my experience with him as a friend and mentor. His commitment to quality, expertise as a researcher, and constant guiding presence were truly enabling.

And to my Hawaiian family, whose love gave me the courage to pursue dreams, I extend my fond aloha.

Finally, I extend my thanks to Todd Larsen, who shared his life and love through it all.

Doris Anne Read

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .	ii
LIST OF TABLES. . . . .	vi
ABSTRACT. . . . .	viii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Identity Development . . . . .	1
Interpersonal Influence. . . . .	3
Implications for Psychology. . . . .	4
Statement of the Problem . . . . .	5
The Purpose of the Study . . . . .	6
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE . . . . .	7
Ego Identity . . . . .	7
Eriksonian Conceptualizations. . . . .	7
Identity Issues. . . . .	9
The Identity Statuses. . . . .	10
Identity and Personality . . . . .	14
Identity, Personality, and College Women . . . . .	15
Identity Status and Interpersonal Relationships. . . . .	19
Social Influence . . . . .	23
General Literature . . . . .	24
Limitation of the Current Literature . . . . .	26
Summary of the Literature Review . . . . .	27
Hypotheses . . . . .	28
Identity and Personality . . . . .	28
Hypothesis 1. . . . .	28
Identity and Social Influence. . . . .	29
Hypothesis 2. . . . .	29

Chapter	Page
Personality and Social Influence . . . . .	29
Hypothesis 3. . . . .	29
III. METHODOLOGY. . . . .	30
Experimental Design . . . . .	30
Subjects . . . . .	31
Measures . . . . .	32
The Objective Measure of Ego Identity Status . . . . .	32
The Test of Attentional and Interpersonal Style . . . . .	33
The Social Interaction Scoring System. . . . .	38
Additional Dependent Measures. . . . .	40
Procedures . . . . .	42
Experimental Treatment . . . . .	43
Debriefing . . . . .	44
Training the Confederates. . . . .	45
Scoring the Social Influence Behavior. . . . .	45
Sample Protocol. . . . .	46
IV. RESULTS. . . . .	51
Reliability of Social Measures . . . . .	52
Identity and Personality . . . . .	55
Classification . . . . .	58
Identity and Social Influence Behavior . . . . .	60
Total Group. . . . .	60
Female Condition . . . . .	62
Male Condition . . . . .	67
Analyses of Variance on Social Interaction Measures and Latency Times . . . . .	71
Personality and Social Influence Behavior. . . . .	76
Experimental Conditions. . . . .	81
V. DISCUSSION . . . . .	84
Major Findings . . . . .	84
Identity Development and Personality . . . . .	84

Chapter	Page
Identity and Social Influence Style. . . . .	87
Total group . . . . .	88
Female condition. . . . .	89
Male condition. . . . .	91
Additional Social Influence Measures . . . . .	94
Social Influence Behavior and Personality. . . . .	96
Conclusions. . . . .	98
Limitation of the Present Research . . . . .	101
Suggestions for Future Research. . . . .	102
REFERENCE NOTES . . . . .	103
REFERENCES. . . . .	104
APPENDICES. . . . .	108
Appendix A. Consent Form. . . . .	109
Appendix B. The Objective Measure of Ego Identity Status . . . . .	110
Appendix C. Test of Attentional and Interpersonal Style . . .	113
Appendix D. Social Interaction Scoring System Manual (Revised). . . . .	120
Appendix E. Scoring Summary Sheet . . . . .	138
Appendix F. Post Experimental Questionnaire . . . . .	140
VITA. . . . .	141

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Presence (+) or Absence (-) of Crisis and Commitment in the Ego Identity Statuses. . . . .	12
2. Mean Ages of Subjects by Group . . . . .	31
3. The Test of Attentional and Interpersonal Style (TAIS) Scales. . . . .	34
4. The Major Categories of the Social Interaction Scoring System . . . . .	41
5. Interrater Reliability on the Social Interaction Scoring System . . . . .	53
6. Interrater Reliability on Latency Scores from Tapes. . . . .	54
7. Discriminant Function, Means and Standard Deviations Between Identity Status and the Test of Attentional and Interpersonal Style: Factors I and II . . . . .	56
8. Percentage of Women Correctly Classified by the Test of Attentional and Interpersonal Style on Discriminant Function . . . . .	59
9. Discriminant Function, Means, and Standard Deviations on Identity Status and the Social Interaction Scoring System: Total Group . . . . .	61
10. Percentage of Women Correctly Classified by the Social Interaction Scoring System on Discriminant Function: Total Group. . . . .	63
11. Discriminant Function, Means, and Standard Deviations on Identity Status and the Social Interaction Scoring System: Female Condition. . . . .	65
12. Percentage of Women Correctly Classified by the Social Interaction Scoring System on Discriminant Function: Female Condition. . . . .	66

Table	Page
13. Discriminant Function, Means, and Standard Deviations on Identity Status and the Social Interaction Scoring System: Male Condition. . . . .	68
14. Percentage of Women Correctly Classified by the Social Interaction Scoring System on Discriminant Function: Male Condition . . . . .	70
15. Analyses of Variance on Total Scores and Latency Measures. . . . .	72
16. Mean Frequencies on the Total Categories of the Social Interaction Scoring System. . . . .	73
17. Mean Latency Times. . . . .	74
18. Factor Analysis on the Test of Attentional and Interpersonal Style and the Social Interaction Scoring System. . . . .	77
19. Analysis of Variance on Derived Factors . . . . .	79
20. Mean Factor Scores from Analysis of Variance of Derived Factors. . . . .	80
21. Analyses of Variance on Experimental Conditions and Candy Consumption Rate. . . . .	82

## ABSTRACT

FEMININE DEVELOPMENT: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN  
IDENTITY STATUS, PERSONALITY AND SOCIAL  
INFLUENCE STYLE

by

Doris Anne Read, Doctor of Philosophy

Utah State University, 1982

Major Professors: Dr. Gerald R. Adams, Dr. William R. Dobson  
Department: Psychology

The purposes of the present research were to investigate the potential relationships between ego identity development, personality characteristics and social influence styles in college women. It was hypothesized that advanced identity development would be associated with more complex personality functioning and effective social influence behavior. Research subjects were classified according to identity status using The Objective Measure of Ego Identity Status. They responded to the Test of Attentional and Interpersonal Style and engaged in a social influence task with a male or female confederate. The advanced statuses generally demonstrated more complex social-cognitive styles that allowed them to both process large amounts of stimulus information and maintain periods of private reflection of their thoughts and feelings. Conversely, the foreclosure women reported a cognitive style characterized by reduced attentional focus. In their social

influence behavior, the advanced statuses employed more direct strategies and a wider repertoire of influence skills. When paired with a male confederate, the use of feminine sex-role stereotypic behavior, such as self-abasement, pleading and whining, increased with advanced identity status. The lower statuses utilized less desirable influence styles that were both placating and authoritarian. No relationship between personality characteristics and social influence style was observed in the present investigation. These findings provide tentative evidence for the relationship between advanced identity development and more complex cognitive and interpersonal styles. The potential effects of sex-role expectations in male-female influence situations were also explored.

(150 pages)



## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Until the late sixties, when the women's liberation movement began to gain momentum in this country, most women achieved a sense of personal identity within the context of the culturally prescribed sex-roles of wife and mother. However, in the last decade there have been gradual changes in the status and legal rights of women, resulting in the expansion of roles and options for women and more broadly defined conceptions of feminine sex-role identity. At the same time, there has been an increased concern with women and power (Johnson, 1978) as women venture past traditionally "appropriate" ways of getting what they want and explore new alternatives.

Currently, the individual woman has more freedom to define herself than ever before, but she must also accommodate a greater variety of expectations and demands from an ever-changing culture. In this context, each woman is faced with the task of optimally integrating both traditional and contemporary attitudes, values, and roles into the formation of her own identity and interpersonal style. This integration process is at least confusing, and for some women has meant periods of struggle and crisis with regard to identity issues.

#### Identity Development

It is deeply rooted in our culture, or perhaps in the nature of femininity itself, that a woman's identity is intimately tied to her relationship with others and her interpersonal roles. In fact,

interpersonal development seems to be the central area of growth for girls during adolescence and an excellent measure of psychosocial adjustment (Douvan & Adelson, 1966). One can observe this interpersonal growth early in the lives of little girls, who seek out best friends and utilize this sharing and intimacy for self-exploration.

As Douvan and Adelson (1966) explain:

For the girl the development of interpersonal ties--the sensitivities, skills, ethics, and values of object ties--forms the core of identity, and it gives expression to much of developing feminine eroticism. . . . It is primarily through these serial, episodic, intimate two-somes that the girl comes to terms with her sexual nature and gradually sorts elements of identification from aspects of individuality to form an identity. The tie to objects is both the key to her erotic realization and also the mechanism through which she arrives at an individuated personal identity. (p. 347)

In later adolescence, the young woman continues her focus on the interpersonal sphere through her attachments to the peer group. Close two-somes are almost the rule within the larger peer group, and those women who cannot establish such close girlfriend relationships often experience a sense of estrangement and loneliness, and a generally more difficult adolescent adjustment. Also during this period, adolescent women expand their interpersonal sphere to include intimacies, although often superficial, with boys. However, these relationships are often adjunctive to girlfriend relationships and are far less important except for the status and prestige they offer (Josselson, 1973; Offer & Offer, 1968). Nonetheless, these relationships are instrumental in that they prepare for future, deeper intimacies and provide an expanded arena for identity testing and development.

A popular idea in feminine development is that identity decisions are postponed until a husband is found (Douvan & Adelson, 1966).

Women, traditionally, have not been expected to form an identity as much as they have to absorb and perpetuate one. They have been expected to adopt identity elements of their parents, to use these in selecting a mate, and to modify them to accommodate to their husband's identity. (Marcia, Note 1, p. 123)

All too frequently what follows the exhaustion of prescribed social roles of student, wife, and mother, is a period of intense questioning of "who I am" independent of interpersonal roles, and what might be called an identity crisis (Marcia, Note 1).

Even in these times of expanded role options, women who choose such "non-traditional" paths as remaining single, not having children, or engaging in homosexual relationships, face similar, if not more complex identity issues. Likewise, women who attempt to integrate traditional and non-traditional roles, may deeply question who they are and experiment with a variety of role options. Thus it seems that the search for identity, once thought to be restricted to adolescence, is now a common experience among women of all ages.

### Interpersonal Influence

The interpersonal sphere and its interface with identity development have been discussed in general terms up to now. Typically interpersonal skills are thought of as a vehicle for creating and maintaining close personal relationships. However, the way a person uses her interpersonal skills to get her needs met with others and influence her environment could also be a critical ingredient in identity development.

From infancy on, humans devise and test ways of expressing their needs and getting others to do what they want. The mode or style of influence one chooses is important not only for immediate success but for how one feels about oneself, how others might feel about the influencer, and how successful one might be in future situations (Raven & Kruglanski, 1970). In addition, the mode of influence one chooses and how others respond are largely determined by sex-role expectations (Johnson, 1976).

In the current ambiguity of women's roles, there is much opportunity for experimentation with a variety of influence styles. However, due to persistent sex-role expectations, this experimentation is not without negative consequences. Many women fear rejection if they venture into traditionally "male" methods of influence or appear too powerful. At the same time, the stereotypic view of women getting their way through helplessness, dependency, guilt, sexuality, and manipulation (Gornick & Moran, 1971) is becoming less acceptable to women and men alike. The popularity of assertiveness training for women attests to the desire of many women to become more confident and effective influencers of others.

#### Implications for Psychology

Women in the process of establishing or redefining their identity often seek psychotherapy or related psychological services. However, women seeking help with identity issues rarely label it as such. Instead, identity crises can be the underlying process in a variety

of presenting problems such as marital and family conflicts, psycho-physiological disorders or depression. Likewise, it is not uncommon to discover that women presenting such problems have difficulty asserting themselves and influencing others effectively enough to meet their needs. Given our assumptions about the critical role of the interpersonal sphere in feminine development, there is reason to suspect that a relationship exists between feminine identity development and interpersonal influence behavior.

Currently, there is an increasing awareness of the limitations of theory and research in psychology to adequately understand the process of feminine identity development (Josselson, 1973). Likewise, there is little understanding of how women utilize interpersonal influence behaviors or how these skills develop. Furthermore, the theoretical foundation of psychotherapy, personality theory, typically emphasizes a focus on personality structure and characteristics. This approach is increasingly questioned regarding its relevance and appropriateness for women, especially since most personality theory has evolved in the context of male behavior (Doherty, 1976). What appears to be needed is a better understanding, supported by research and relevant theory, of the relationships between interpersonal behaviors, personality characteristics, and feminine identity development. The present research addresses these issues.

#### Statement of the Problem

Although interest in feminine development has gained popularity over the last decade, there continues to be empirical and theoretical

deficits in the areas of feminine identity development, interpersonal influence behavior and personality theory relevant to changing women's roles. Existing theory and research in these areas are largely focused on male development and behavior. Assuming that methods and approaches of psychotherapy are based upon theory, our methods of dealing with women and their current developmental issues may warrant careful revision.

### The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to investigate the potential relationships between feminine identity development, personality characteristics and interpersonal influence behavior. Both self-report measures and behavioral observations will be utilized with college age women to investigate these relationships. A goal of this descriptive study is to contribute to the present theory by providing evidence for specific behavior correlates for existing theoretical constructs of identity development. If such relationships can be established, then this clinically relevant material could be utilized in diagnostic evaluations, evaluations of change in psychotherapy, pairing of therapist and client, and longitudinal studies of developmental change. In addition, direct observations of feminine social influence behaviors will provide insights regarding behavioral deficits and strengths associated with specific personality variables and levels of identity formation. Such insights can be translated into skill development training and utilized in affective education and psychotherapy.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Most of the current research and theory in the area of identity development has arisen out of Erik Erikson's conceptualizations of ego identity development (Bourne, 1978a; 1978b). Even though Erikson's construct of identity evolved largely in the context of male development, it has nonetheless become the principal theoretical tool for understanding the movement from adolescence to adulthood. Because a model of feminine development comparable to Erikson's is not yet available, there is a growing body of literature in which the male model is necessarily applied to women, with a critical focus on sex differences. In the following chapter, this theoretical and empirical literature will be presented, with emphasis upon behavior and personality correlates. In addition, the literature concerning interpersonal influence behavior will be discussed.

#### Ego Identity

##### Eriksonian Conceptualizations

Erikson's model of understanding psycho-social development utilizes the epigenetic principle.

Somewhat generalized, this principle states that anything that grows has a ground plan, and that out of this ground plan parts arise, each having its time of special ascendancy, until all parts have risen to form a functioning whole. (Erikson, 1968, p. 92)

According to Erikson, personality is thought "to develop according to steps predetermined in the human organism's readiness to be driven



toward, to be aware of, and to interact with a widening radius of significant individuals and institutions" (1968, p. 93).

Erikson's theory outlines a sequence of eight phases of psychosocial development, each of which is characterized by a developmental task which must be solved within it. The stages, labelled according to extremes of successful and unsuccessful resolution of this task, are: (1) basic trust versus mistrust; (2) autonomy versus shame and doubt; (3) initiative versus guilt; (4) industry versus inferiority; (5) identity versus identity diffusion; (6) intimacy versus isolation; (7) generativity versus stagnation; (8) integrity versus despair. Each stage represents a particular "crisis" that dominates that period, although it may reoccur at different times throughout the life cycle. Also, the elements of each state are related and resolution of the crises of previous stages contributes to resolution at subsequent stages. The resolution, which in reality is almost never as extreme as the label would suggest, falls somewhere between the two polarities, with emphasis on the positive.

The critical stage confronted in late adolescence, identity versus identity diffusion is essentially a period of integration.

From a genetic point of view, then, the process of identity formation emerges as an evolving configuration--a configuration which is gradually established by successive ego syntheses and resyntheses throughout childhood; it is a configuration gradually integrating constitutional givens, idiosyncratic libidinal needs, favored capacities, significant identifications, effective defenses, successful sublimations, and consistent roles. (Erikson, 1956, p. 71)



This integration process doesn't happen all at once, but evolves gradually. The adolescent faces innumerable decisions related to his self-definition, each of which has identity-forming implications. These decisions and the bases upon which they are made begin to form a structure or core of the individual's identity (Marcia, Note 2). Successful resolution, or the sense of identity, is "the accrued confidence that one's ability to maintain inner sameness and continuity . . . is matched by the sameness and continuity of one's meaning for others" (Erikson, 1959, p. 89). Failure to resolve the crisis at this stage results in identity diffusion, which suggests a "splitting of self-images, a loss of centrality, a sense of dispersion and confusion, and a fear of dissolution" (Erikson, 1959, pp. 122-123).

### Identity Issues

The developmental process, or crisis of adolescence, involves an expanding awareness of role alternatives. The term suggests tension, conflict, and chaos, which may be present; however it is more realistically a process of relinquishing old identifications and risking the exploration of the new and unfamiliar. The adolescent is essentially in a state of psychosocial moratorium (Erikson, 1968) which allows free-role experimentation and testing of potentials with the support of society and its institutions. However, towards the end of adolescence, society begins to pressure the individual to narrow alternatives and make decisions leading to meaningful commitments.

Two areas having critical developmental significance during this period are choice of occupation and ideology. "In general, it is primarily the inability to settle on an occupational identity which disturbs young people" (Erikson, 1963, p. 252). Alternatives must be explored and tested until a personally expressed and legitimate occupation can be chosen. Erikson calls ideology "something-between-a-theory-and-a-religion" (1959, p. 142) or a way of envisioning life and the future through a unification of tradition and contemporary ideals. ". . . it is the ideological potential of a society which speaks most clearly to the adolescent who is so eager to be affirmed by peers, to be confirmed by teachers and to be inspired by worthwhile 'ways of life'" (Erikson, 1968, p. 130). The ideological identity becomes a vehicle for interpersonal interaction and paves the way for exploration of intimacy through shared ideals.

### The Identity Statuses

Erikson's conceptualizations about identity formation, introduced for the purpose of clinical analysis, are not readily applicable to empirical study. In order to define ego identity in a way that could be reliably observed, Marcia (1966) developed a semi-structured interview which identified four statuses or modes of response to the identity crisis: identity achievement, moratorium, foreclosure, and identity diffusion. The degree of crisis or commitment in the areas of occupation, politics, and religion are the criteria used to establish identity status. "Crisis refers to the adolescent's

period of engagement in choosing among meaningful alternatives; commitment refers to the degree of personal investment the individual exhibits" (Marcia, 1966, p. 551).

According to these criteria, identity achievement individuals have experienced a crisis and have emerged with occupational and ideological commitments based on their own evaluations. Moratorium individuals are currently in crisis and are in the process of making formal commitments. Those in the foreclosure status have experienced no crises and have made firm commitments based on values adopted from parents or others. Identity diffusion persons lack commitments and are not experiencing crisis in search of commitment. The identity achievement and moratorium statuses are generally considered more advanced in identity formation than foreclosure and identity diffusion. The nature of each status, with regard to the presence of crisis and commitment, is presented in Table 1.

This semi-structured interview technique, called the Identity Status Interview, enables researchers to subject Marcia's translation of Erikson's identity development model to empirical study. A second instrument, the Ego-Identity Incomplete Sentence Blank, is a 23-item, semi-structured projective test, also developed by Marcia. In addition, Adams, Shea, and Fitch (1979) developed the Objective Measure of Identity Status (OM-EIS), which was validated with the Marcia instruments. The OM-EIS allows screening and classification of large numbers of subjects, without the problems inherent in interview methods. These instruments, offering empirical approaches to theory, have stimulated a wide range of research during recent years.

Table 1

Presence (+) or Absence (-) of Crisis and  
Commitment in the Ego Identity Statuses

Identity Status	Crisis	Commitment
Identity Diffusion	-	-
Foreclosure	-	+
Moratorium	+	-
Identity Achievement	+	+

Note: The identity statuses are presented in descending order of psycho-social maturity. Identity diffusion is considered less mature because of the lack of both crisis and commitment. Foreclosure is also a lower status due to the lack of crisis prior to commitment. Moratorium is a higher status due to the presence of crisis in preparation for commitment. Identity achieved is the most advanced status due to the presence of both crisis and commitment.

It should be noted that Marcia's constructs were originally validated using male subjects and much of the early research using the Identity Status Interview was done with males. There was some question as to the validity of Marcia's constructs for women, especially with regard to the priority given to occupation, politics, and religion in the identity formation of women. Given the theoretical and empirical emphases on the critical nature of the interpersonal sphere for women (Douvan & Adelson, 1966), it seemed appropriate to tap interpersonal identity in order to more accurately assess a woman's identity status. Attitudes toward premarital sex appeared to reflect this complex of interpersonal issues and was added to the occupation and ideology dimensions on the Identity Status Interview (Marcia & Friedman, 1970). With the addition of this dimension, the identity status distribution among women produced discrete and consistent groupings similar to those for men (Schenkel & Marcia, 1972).

Since 1964, more than 30 studies have investigated cognitive, behavioral, and personality correlates of the identity statuses. Most of these studies have been cross-sectional (Bourne, 1978a). However, there is an increasing focus on the long term stability of the identity statuses and re-evaluation of identity formation as a process rather than a static construct. A number of studies (Waterman, Geary, & Waterman, 1974; Waterman & Goldman, 1976; Adams & Fitch, Note 3) provide evidence that progressive developmental shifts in identity status, from diffusion to more advanced statuses, take place as one moves from adolescence into adulthood. Moreover, it

is apparent that regressive changes, such as from achievement to moratorium, also take place. These findings support Erikson's notion that resolution of the identity crisis during adolescence "guarantees only that one will be faced with subsequent identity crises" (Marcia, Note 2). Identity formation is not a static event restricted to adolescence, but a process which extends into adulthood.

### Identity and Personality

The investigation of personality variables associated with the identity statuses has been a major direction in identity development research. As previously mentioned, Marcia's constructs which were originally validated with males, stimulated considerable subsequent research with male college students. Generally, those males able to be classified by the identity status criterion performed as hypothesized on personality measures. That is, with increased development, the more advanced statuses were associated with more complex and differentiated personality functioning.

It has been shown that identity achievement and moratorium subjects tend to perform better than foreclosure and diffusion subjects on such dimensions as manipulability of self-esteem (Marcia, 1967), internal-external locus of control (Waterman, Beubel, & Waterman, 1970), authoritarianism (Marcia, 1966, 1967), concept attainment under stress (Marcia, 1966), moral reasoning (Podd, 1972), and interpersonal relationships and intimacy (Orlofsky, Marcia, & Lesser, 1973; Marcia, 1976), and personal autonomy (Orlofsky et al., 1973). Looking at impulsivity versus reflectivity in cognitive style, Waterman and Waterman (1974) found that the lower statuses were more

impulsive, resulting in more errors, than the men in advanced statuses. These studies supported the hypothesis that the advanced statuses were also more advanced in terms of personality functioning and inspired similar research with female subjects.

### Identity, Personality, and College Women

Identity status research with women has been given far less attention than investigations with male subjects. Therefore, without further empirical evidence, conclusions about the complexity of personality functioning for women would be premature. However, the presently available research using the identity statuses with females shows similar patterns of personality functioning as were found with college men. That is, more advanced statuses tend to be associated with greater complexity of personality attributes.

Josselson (1973) has constructed distinctive portraits of college women in the various identity statuses, utilizing the developmental data obtained from extensive semi-structured interviews. This study provides the most comprehensive picture of identity status differences in college women available in the current literature. Identity achievement women are described as independent, flexible, and able to tolerate frustration while being able to bounce back from adversity. They devote their energies to seeking identity confirming experiences and derive their self-esteem from explorations of their own talents, abilities, and relationships. Moratorium women, characterized by intense affect and introspection, are described as the most insightful and sensitive of the statuses. However, in their struggle for independence and commitment, they experience internal conflicts and



guilt about the "betrayal" of parental expectations. In their search to find the "right" answers, they are unable to make stable commitments. The foreclosure women, in contrast, are preoccupied with recreating family security and carrying out parental values. Although they appear initially self-assured and goal-oriented, they demonstrate marked fears of the world outside the family and show little tolerance for ambiguity. Foreclosure women are described as psychologically child-like. Diffusion individuals are highly involved in fantasy and seem disconnected from their pasts and futures. The most depression and psychopathology has been found within this status.

There are a number of studies in which identity achievement women differ significantly in the direction of higher personality functioning from the identity diffusion women. These personality variables include: conformity and negative affect (Toder & Marcia, 1973); locus of control (Howard, 1975; Adams & Shea, 1979); anxiety (Schenkel & Marcia, 1972); field-dependence (Schenkel, 1975); and moral reasoning (Poppen, 1974). More specifically, women classified as identity diffused tend to be more conforming, anxious, and negative in their affect, as well as more feminine or undifferentiated with regard to psychological androgyny. In addition, the identity diffused women manifest a tendency towards external locus of control, lower levels of ego development, and less sophisticated moral reasoning. These findings lend support to the developmental hypothesis that higher statuses are associated with greater complexity and differentiation of personality functioning. They also support Erikson's theory of identity diffusion being associated with lack of commitment.



With regard to women in the foreclosure status, the findings are more difficult to interpret. Among female college students, foreclosure and identity achieved women tend to perform more alike as a group, distinct from moratorium and diffusion women. Identity achieved and foreclosure women are more likely to choose more difficult majors and reported less anxiety than moratorium subjects (Marcia & Friedman, 1970). They were likely to conform less to Asch-type situations (Toder & Marcia, 1973) and to manifest higher levels of field independence (Schenkel, 1975), self-esteem, and psychological androgyny (Prager, 1977).

This pattern is distinctly different from that found with male college students. As Marcia (1976) explains:

Most of our research with men suggested that chronological proximity to identity achievement was a crucial factor in the grouping of the statuses. That is, Moratorium could be expected to behave most like Identity Achievement on any measure involving ego strength, while Foreclosures would perform most like Identity Diffusions. However, with women, the stability of the identity status was emerging as the important issue. Identity Achievement and Foreclosure are both fairly stable statuses; both groups have an identity, even though one is achieved and the other, foreclosed. Moratorium and Identity Diffusion are unstable statuses; neither one has a firm sense of identity, although Moratoriums are moving towards it. (p. 103)

It has been suggested that the foreclosure status may be a more adaptive and socially-confirmed response to the identity crisis for women than for men, resulting in foreclosure women behaving much like the identity achieved. However, not all studies using the identity statuses have confirmed this hypothesis. Orlofsky (1978) suggests that conclusions about sex differences among the identity statuses may be premature. More critically, he points out limitations

in comparing most ego-identity research, in which male and female samples have been drawn from different populations, classified with different identity status measures and assessed on different dependent measures.

In a definitive study which controlled for these factors, Orlofsky (1978) found that on measures of fear of success and need for achievement, moratorium and identity achievement men and women performed as a group distinct from foreclosures and identity diffusions. Moratorium and identity achievement individuals of both sexes scored highest in achievement scores, while the foreclosures and identity diffusions had the lowest scores. However, on fear of success measures the females in the advanced statuses scored highest, along with the diffusion and foreclosure men. Although males and females differed on the fear of success dimension, the status groupings based on proximity to identity achievement, remained consistent.

Marcia (Note 2) suggests that the relative adaptiveness of the statuses for women might be better understood in terms of the personality dimension being measured and the "existing cultural supports for women's explorations of alternatives" (p. 39). Marcia (Note 1) further suggests that the foreclosure status appears adaptive only because of the existing "social props" which support women remaining "child-like," unaware of personally relevant explorations, and defensively rigid about their positions. He concludes that in a context where equal social support were extended to women for either a moratorium or foreclosure pathway through the identity crises,

that moratorium would emerge as the status, like identity achievement, reflecting greater ego strength (Marcia, Note 2).

In summary, although there are mixed findings in the literature relating identity status and personality dimensions, the empirical results generally support a central proposition of this study. That is, the more advanced levels of identity formation are associated with more complex and advanced levels of personality functioning.

#### Identity Status and Interpersonal Relationships

Erikson (1968) has advanced the idea that towards late adolescence and early adulthood, when identity formation is well on its way, the individual becomes capable of truly intimate relationships with others. These mutual relationships are sought in a variety of ways, "be it in friendship, in erotic encounters, or in joint inspiration" (p. 135). The basic requirement of intimacy is that one comes to know himself, or establishes an identity, before he can share himself with others. Again, we should note that Erikson speaks of males. However, his notion that a youth who is uncertain of his identity either shies away from interpersonal affinities or dives in promiscuously, may have some relevance for women.

Erikson's theoretical perspectives and the empirical data relating advanced identity formation and personality functioning, lead to hypotheses about interpersonal relationships. It is reasonable to speculate that individuals in the advanced identity statuses might demonstrate more complex and mature modes of functioning in interpersonal social behavior. A few studies have

investigated the relationship between identity status and interpersonal relations.

Josselson (1973), for example, has described women in the advanced statuses as more involved and successful in peer relationships. In her investigation, identity achievement women chose close relationships with men which enhanced their self-esteem while also utilizing peer support to help them become less dependent on their parents. Moratorium women demonstrated an intense, almost desperate need for relationships and tended to identify strongly with peers as a way of "trying on" different ways of behaving. In contrast, meaningful relationships for the foreclosure women almost always failed. Foreclosed women appeared "unable to establish enough trust outside the family for friendships to form" (Josselson, 1973, p. 15). Boyfriends are usually seen as parental substitutes and as someone to "cling to." Diffusion women were seen as isolated and alienated among their peers.

Kacerguis and Adams (1980) have also demonstrated a relationship between identity and intimacy using Orlofsky's (1976) Intimacy Interview. Intimacy statuses were assigned to individuals according to depth of relationship and degree of heterosexual commitment. The Intimate status reflects the presence of a close and enduring intimate relationship. The Pre-intimate status characterizes an individual who has deep relationships with others, but lacks an enduring heterosexual tie. Stereotyped and Pseudo-Intimate relationships both have a superficial quality, but the pseudo-intimate person usually shows a presence of a heterosexual tie, whereas the

stereotyped individual reveals the absence of a committed heterosexual partnership. Finally, the Isolate status depicts persons who have few interpersonal ties and poorly developed interpersonal skills. Identity achievement and moratorium women and men were more likely to be found in the higher intimacy statuses, while the majority of diffusion and foreclosure women were observed to be in the lower intimacy statuses. Furthermore, identity achievement women were the most inclined to report being in love.

The general tendency for the advanced statuses to demonstrate greater capacity for intimacy was also reported by Orlofsky et al. (1973) and Marcia (1976) in their studies with college males. Orlofsky et al. (1973) found that identity achievement persons were more likely to be involved in intimate interpersonal relationships, while foreclosure and identity diffusion individuals engaged in stereotyped or superficial heterosexual relations. Moratorium persons generally reflected the higher intimacy statuses, but were the most variable. No diffusion persons were reported in the higher intimacy categories and 30% of these people were in the isolate status. Marcia's (1976) investigation revealed similar findings. In addition, this study yielded longitudinal data over a four-year period. It was shown that progressive developmental shifts in identity status (e.g., diffusion to moratorium) were likely to be accompanied by parallel advancements in intimacy status.

Another important study using both college men and women is worth mention here, in that it investigates the relationship between identity status and interactional style. Donovan (1975), using

self-report measures and direct observation in the classroom, found that achievement individuals were more mature, calm, and nurturant than other statuses and less engaged in power struggles, authority issues, and personal conflicts (e.g., low self-esteem or struggles for independence). Moratorium individuals displayed a great deal of independence, were most often competing with the instructor for group control, and were most emotionally responsive to others, including expression of their negative feelings. The foreclosure individuals were interpersonally active, but dependent on the instructor for structure. They handled their disagreements and emotions with politeness and neutrality. The behavior of the diffusion individuals was characterized by withdrawal, non-involvement, and some social inappropriateness (e.g., they appeared shy, frightened, and vulnerable with their peers).

In summary, there is evidence that the advanced statuses are not only more successful in intimate relationships, but may also have more complex modes of relating interpersonally. This interpersonal style associated with advanced identity statuses may contribute to the capacity for more mature and intimate relationships. Unfortunately, the studies reviewed here have the methodological limitation of being either clinical or interview studies, with the exception of Donovan (1975), who combined clinical assessments with observations. Presently, there are no studies that have investigated the potential relationships between identity formation and the interpersonal interactions of women, using direct behavioral observations. Given the theoretical importance attributed to the

interpersonal sphere in the identity formation of women (Douvan & Adelson, 1966), an investigation addressing these issues would appear critical.

### Social Influence

Social influence, often referred to in the literature as interpersonal influence or power, may be defined as the ability to get another person to do or believe in something she or he would not necessarily have done or believed spontaneously (Johnson, 1976). In more technical terms, it is the amount of tension towards change which a person can bring to bear on another person's "life space" (Cartwright, 1959). As previously suggested, the style of influence one chooses is important not only for immediate success, but for how one feels about oneself, how others feel about the influencer and how successful one might be in the future (Raven & Kruglanski, 1970). It is specifically these issues that are of potential concern to women as they explore alternative ways of using their power and influence.

Additionally, McClelland (1975) has stressed the importance of development and social-emotional maturity in the expression of power motives, observing that mature individuals utilize more differentiated and situationally appropriate repertoires of influence behaviors. For example, more mature women were active, assertive, and able to express their anger openly. In contrast, less mature women did not express aggressive impulses and were concerned with losing voluntary emotional controls.



### General Literature

There are presently no studies in the literature investigating the relationship between identity and social influence style. However, there are a number of studies that generally support the persistence of a cultural standard for women in social influence behavior. That is, a standard that inhibits direct overt expression of physical and verbal aggression and dictates more passive and dependent behavior in interpersonal relations (Braginsky, 1970). There are also a number of studies which demonstrate considerable variation in feminine social influence behavior and suggest potential bases for these differences. Both types of studies are reviewed here.

Johnson (1978), in an investigation of power attribution, has reported the potential for double standards in the use of power in interactional sequences used by males and females. College students identified reward, coercion, legitimacy, direct information, and expertise as masculine forms of power. Referent power, helplessness, indirect information, false information, nagging, and sexuality were identified as typically feminine power types. It appears that strong sex-role expectations are associated with differential attributions of influence behavior for college men and women. An additional study by Savasta (1977), which has examined social influence behaviors in adolescent opposite-sex dyads, supports the notion that sex-role expectations are reflected in actual social behavior. Females differed from males in their social influence style by showing more attentiveness, submission, deception, nagging,



and conflicting assertive-yielding ("fickle female") behaviors in interactional settings.

Morgan (1978) has also reported feminine strategies which are in harmony with sex-role expectations. In this study, in which students imagined themselves as actors attempting to influence another person, it was reported that females utilized more personal reward, suggestions for exchange and flattery than males. In addition, females used more "talk" as a strategy than did males. Likewise, Falbo and Peplau (1980) reported that women in dating couples tended to use more indirect and unilateral strategies such as emotionally or physically withdrawing from their partners.

Noting the importance of gender difference in social influence behavior, Falbo (1977a) investigated the effects of sex-role self-concept in power strategy utilization. Classifying students as feminine, masculine, androgeneous, or undifferentiated, she found that feminine people, regardless of gender, reported using more tears, emotional manipulation, and subtlety as strategies in essays entitled "How I Get My Way." Extending this line of research to college students in intimate relationships, Falbo and Peplau (Note 4) found a trend consistent with previous findings. That is, feminine individuals, in intimate relationships, were more likely to report indirect and unilateral strategies, such as pouting, while masculine persons reported more direct strategies, such as asking.

Looking for other variables besides sex-related factors which might determine social influence behaviors, Falbo (1977b) investigated the relationship of personality variables and power strategies in

student essays. People scoring high on social desirability reported being more likely to use such strategies as hinting, thought manipulation, and bargaining, while low scorers used threats and fait accompli ("openly doing what one wants without avoiding the other person").

Persons who scored high in conformity to group pressure reported being more likely to use reason, expertise, simple statements, and persistence, while individuals who resist group pressure reported doing so through evasion. High scorers on Machiavellian measures reported greater likelihood of using emotional alteration of the partner, hinting and thought manipulation. Low scorers reported using simple statements, persistence, and assertion. This study demonstrates an association between personality characteristics and social influence behaviors and suggests that personality factors may be a basis for within-sex differences in social influence style.

#### Limitation of the Current Literature

The literature on social influence behavior of women is limited in a number of ways. First, its focus is restricted to male-female differences and the relationship of social influence to personality style. Second, the studies directly investigating social influence strategies of women used self-report measures rather than behavioral observations. This, of course, leaves a gap in the knowledge between what women say they do versus how they actually perform. Third, and most important, there are presently no investigations of the relationship between identity development and social influence behavior.

In addition, the present literature has neglected the personal characteristics of the target person, the individual being influenced,

as a potential determinant of social influence style. Specifically, the relationship between the sex of the target person and social influence behavior has not been investigated. Given the cultural expectations for feminine behavior (Braginsky, 1970) and the ambivalence of many women about out-of-role behavior with males (Spence & Helmrich, 1972), it is reasonable to speculate that women may use different social influence strategies with men versus women. Although a number of students have looked at feminine social influence behavior with males, none have compared the potential differences with female target persons. Likewise, none of the previous studies have controlled for the personality characteristics of the target-person by utilizing confederates.

#### Summary of the Literature Review

Marcia's (1966) operationalization of Erikson's (1956) psychosocial theory of identity development has generated much research in recent years. The investigations using both male and female subjects demonstrate a strong relationship between the advanced identity statuses and higher levels of maturity and complexity of personality characteristics and interpersonal functioning. Interpersonal relationships are considered especially critical in the identity formation of women, but there are presently no studies that directly address this issue. In the social influence literature there are few studies that address individual differences in how women use their power and no investigation which relates psychosocial development and the social influence behavior of women.

Likewise, the relationship of influence behavior and sex of the target person has been neglected.

This literature review attempts to bring together these areas of research with the assumption that learning to appropriately and effectively use power and interpersonal influence is a critical identity issue for women today. The central proposition is that the more advanced levels of identity formation will be associated with more complex and differentiated social influence styles in women.

### Hypotheses

The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship of ego identity status, personality and social influence style in women, when paired with same- versus opposite-sex partners in a social influence situation. The .05 level of significance will be used to test the following hypotheses.

#### Identity and Personality

Previous research has shown a relationship between ego identity status and a number of personality variables (Adams & Shea, 1979; Josselson, 1973; Orlofsky, 1978). These studies generally support the proposition that higher identity statuses reflect more complex and differentiated personality styles. Therefore, the first hypothesis, stated in null form, is:

Hypothesis 1. There will be no significant differences between the four ego identity status groups with respect to personality characteristics, as measured by the Test of Attentional and Interpersonal style.

### Identity and Social Influence

Several studies of identity and interpersonal behavior (Josselson, 1973; Donovan, 1975; Kacerguis & Adams, 1980) have shown a relationship between advanced identity statuses and more mature and complex modes of interpersonal relating. However, it is uncertain whether this relationship will be demonstrated with social influence behavior, specifically when attempting to influence same- versus opposite-sex individuals. Therefore, the second hypothesis, in null form, is:

Hypothesis 2. There will be no significant differences between the four ego identity status groups with respect to social influence behavior, when paired with same- versus opposite-sex partners, as measured by the Social Interaction Scoring System.

### Personality and Social Influence

Several studies demonstrate an association between personality characteristics and social influence behaviors, suggesting that personality factors may mediate social influence styles (Falbo, 1977a, 1977b; Falbo & Peplau, Note 4). Therefore, the third hypothesis, stated in null form, is:

Hypothesis 3. There will be no significant relationship between personality characteristics, as measured by the Test of Attentional and Interpersonal Style, and social influence behavior, as measured by the Social Interaction Scoring System.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY

The purposes of this research were to investigate the potential associations between (1) feminine identity development and personality characteristics, (2) identity and social influence behavior, with same versus opposite-sex partners, and (3) personality characteristics and social influence behavior. The studies cited in the previous chapter have the critical methodological limitations of utilizing predominantly self-report and objective measures, to the neglect of direct behavioral observations. Therefore, to accomplish the aims of this study and improve upon previous methodologies, a combination of direct behavioral observations and objective measures were used in this descriptive study of feminine development.

#### Experimental Design

The structure of this research is a 2 x 4 factorial design. The two independent variables are: the sex of confederate (male or female) and ego identity status (diffusion, foreclosure, moratorium, and identity-achievement). The major dependent variables are personality, as measured by an objective test, and social influence behavior, which has been operationalized into mutually exclusive social influence behavior categories.

### Subjects

A total of 279 female undergraduate students at Utah State University consented to participate in the present study (see Appendix A), and were screened for identity status, using The Objective Measure of Ego Identity Status (Adams et al., 1979). These students were recruited from undergraduate classes in psychology, education, sociology, human development, business, and nursing. In this initial sample, 18% were classified as identity achievement, while 55% were moratorium, 8% foreclosure, 11% identity diffusion, and 8% mixed statuses (such as moratorium-achievement). Volunteers were recruited from this group of women and randomly assigned to the treatment condition. Eighty subjects were required to fill the eight cells created by two treatment conditions and four classification categories. These women represented a wide variety of college majors, and were relatively homogeneous with respect to age (see Table 2).

Table 2  
Mean Ages of Subjects by Group

Treatment Condition	Identity Status			
	D	F	M	A
Male	21.3	19.6	19.7	19.4
Female	19.6	19.1	19.3	19.9



All subjects were white, middle-class women from the western United States, who were attending a small university in a rural and conservative community.

### Measures

The major classification measure chosen for this study was the Objective Measure of Ego Identity Status (Adams et al., 1979). The two major dependent measures selected were: the Test of Attentional and Interpersonal Style (Nideffer, 1976) and the Social Interaction Scoring System (Savasta, 1977).

#### The Objective Measure of Ego Identity Status

The Objective Measure of Ego Identity Status (OM-EIS [see Appendix B]) developed by Adams et al. (1979) was used to classify subjects into the four ego identity status categories: identity diffusion, foreclosure, moratorium, and identity achievement. This newly developed questionnaire is an objective measure of ego identity status which consists of 24 items, with six items reflecting each of the four statuses. Each series of six items includes statements regarding the presence of crisis and commitment in the areas of occupation, religion, and politics. A six-point Likert scale is used for subjects to reflect the extent to which statements are similar to their own self-perceptions. Each subject is given an overall stage score which is converted into a status category according to derived mean scores and standard deviations for each stage. Subjects are also given individual stage scores for the four categories to show distribution of responses.



Test-retest reliabilities are provided for each subscale and range from .71 to .93 ( $p < .01$  or better). In addition, the OM-EIS has been shown to maintain predictive and concurrent validities with the Marcia Ego Identity Incomplete Sentence Blank and Marcia's Ego Identity Interview. In a comparison with the Incomplete Sentence Blank, the OM-EIS was shown to maintain its validity for both males and females. Likewise, in a series of studies (Adams et al., 1979), the OM-EIS has been shown to be free of social desirability response bias and maintains theoretically appropriate predictive validity for the various identity status categories with age and such personality constructs as self-acceptance, rigidity, and authoritarianism.

#### The Test of Attentional and Interpersonal Style

The Test of Attentional and Interpersonal Style (TAIS [see Appendix C]), developed by Nideffer (1976), was chosen because of its focus on the assessment of attentional and interpersonal factors that influence an individual's functioning in a wide variety of settings. These factors can then be compared to attentional and interpersonal demands of particular situations for the purpose of formulating behavioral predictions.

The TAIS consists of 17 scales (see Table 3) divided into three major areas: attention, control, and interpersonal style. The six attentional scales are concerned with how individuals control the width and direction of their attention. They are: (1) Broad external attentional focus (BET); (2) Overload external stimuli (OET); (3) Broad internal attention focus (BIT); (4) Overload internal stimuli (OIT);

TABLE 3

## The Test of Attentional and Interpersonal Style (TAIS) Scales

Scale	Abbreviation	Description
Broad external attentional focus	BET	High scores on this scale are obtained by individuals who describe themselves as being able to effectively integrate many external stimuli at one time.
Overloaded by external stimuli	OET	The higher the score, the more individuals make mistakes because they become confused and overloaded with external stimuli.
Broad internal attentional focus	BIT	High scores indicate that individuals see themselves as able to effectively integrate ideas and information from several different areas. They see themselves as analytical and philosophical.
Overloaded by internal stimuli	OIT	The higher the score, the more mistakes individuals make because they confuse themselves by thinking about too many things at once.
Narrow attentional focus	NAR	The higher the score, the more effective individuals see themselves with respect to being able to narrow their attention when they need to (e.g., to study or read a book).
Reduced attentional focus	RED	A high score on this scale indicates that the individuals make mistakes because they narrow their attention too much.
Information processing	INFP	High scorers tend to process a great deal of stimulus information. Their perceptual-cognitive worlds are busy.

TABLE 3 (cont.)

Scale	Abbreviation	Description
Behavior control	BCON	A high score indicates that individuals tend to be somewhat impulsive. In addition, they engaged in behavior that could be considered antisocial, though not necessarily harmful.
Control scale	CON	A high score indicates that individuals are in control of most of the situations, interpersonal and otherwise, they find themselves in.
Self-esteem	SES	The higher the score, the more highly the individuals think of themselves.
Physical orientation	P/O	A high score indicates the individual participates in and enjoys competitive athletics.
Obsessive	OBS	A high score indicates the person has a tendency to ruminate and worry about one particular thing without any real resolution or movement.
Extroversion	EXT	A high score indicates the individual is warm, outgoing, needs to be with other people, is the life of the party.
Introversion	INT	A high score indicates the person likes to be alone, enjoys quiet thoughtful times, and avoids being the center of attention.
Intellectual expression	EIX	A high score indicates that individuals express their thoughts and ideas to other people.

TABLE 3 (cont.)

Scale	Abbreviation	Description
Negative affective expression	NAE	A high score indicates that individuals express their anger and negative feelings to others.
Positive affective expression	PAE	A high score indicates the individuals express their feelings of affection to others in both physical and verbal ways.

(5) Narrow attentional focus (NAR), and (6) Reduced attentional focus (RED). The control scales reflect the amount of information individuals perceive they deal with and the amount of control they exert over their experience. They are: (1) information processing (INFP) and (2) Behavior control (BCON). The interpersonal scales reflect varying components of an individual's interactional style and interact with the attentional scales to further refine behavioral predictions. The scales are as follows: (1) Control (CON); (2) Self-esteem (SES); (3) Physical orientation (P/O); (4) Obsessive (OBSS); (5) Extroversion (EXT); (6) Introversion (INT); (7) Intellectual expression (IEX); (8) Negative affect expression (NAE); and (9) Positive affect expression (PAE).

The TAIS is a 144-item, self-administered objective measure that takes 15-25 minutes to complete. It is designed for individuals over 15 years of age. Raw scores are plotted on profiles which yield corresponding T-scores.

Test-retest reliabilities with psychology students over a two-week period ranged from .60 (OBSS) to .93 (P/O) with a mean of .83 (Nideffer, Note 5). Construct validity between the attentional scales and anxiety measures, such as the State-Trait Anxiety Index and Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale, was established in several studies (Nideffer, 1976). For example, the TAIS subscales Overload by internal stimuli (OIT), Overload by external stimuli (OET), and Reduced attention (RED) were significantly correlated with state anxiety, trait anxiety, and manifest anxiety ( $r = .31 - .58, p < .01$ ). The TAIS Self-esteem scale (SES) was significantly and negatively

correlated with the three measures of anxiety ( $r = -.35$  to  $-.57$ ,  $p < .05$ ). In addition, when compared with the Personal Orientation Inventory, the TAIS Self-esteem scale correlated .69 with the POI self-regard, and the TAIS Introversion correlated  $-.61$  with the POI spontaneity scale. Additional construct and concurrent validity was established between the TAIS scales and various measures, including the California F scale, the Rotter I-E scale, the MMPI, and Maudsley Personality Inventory.

Predictive validity between the TAIS and performance has been established in several studies. In one investigation (Nideffer, 1976), coaches' performance ratings of male college swimmers were significantly correlated with TAIS attentional scales. Also, in a study of female students in a counseling course (Nideffer, 1976), the TAIS was able to discriminate between groups of women with distinct personality characteristics. In both studies, poor attentional control and the tendency to make errors of underinclusion were related to performance deficits. In other studies of predictive validity, the TAIS has been shown to differentiate between both heterogeneous groups (such as psychiatric patients versus normals), and relatively homogeneous groups (applicants rejected versus accepted for police training) with regard to attentional and personality variables (Nideffer, Note 5).

#### The Social Interaction Scoring System

The Social Interaction Scoring System (SISS) was devised by Savasta (1977) as a quantitative measure of the theoretical construct of power as a social influence process. Savasta's model assumes that:

(1) a person has power when that person can get someone else to do what she would not otherwise do; (2) behaviors observed during a social influence situation make up a person's "social influence repertoire", and (3) a person's power style can be described in terms of her control of information about the self, other, and the world.

The SISS is designed to be an information control measure of power, an extension of the idea that what is communicated in the social influence situation is controlled information about the self, the other, and the world. One can evoke certain images about the self through demonstrating behaviors along an assertive-yielding continuum. This control of information about the self is labeled Image Control. One can also evoke an image of mutual dependency that suggests that dominance and submission are at neutral levels. This inter-dependency image is labeled Resource Control. Control of information about the other, based on positive or negative feedback directed toward the other, is labeled Sanctions Control. Finally, control of information about the world, based on deception or manipulation, is labeled Perception Control.

The original scoring system, from which the present dependent measure was derived, consists of social interaction categories synthesized from the work of over 15 interactional researchers including Murray, Goffman, Russell, and French and Raven (Savasta, 1977). The four information control categories are further broken down into numerous descriptive sub-categories of interactional behavior. Observed behavioral frequencies and proportions are



combined to yield a quantitative measure of social influence behavior. Inter-rater reliability for each category was established by computing the proportion of rater agreement; i.e., the number of observations agreed upon divided by the total number of observations. Ten to 20 observations per category were sampled. Category reliabilities ranged from .80 to 1.00 with an overall reliability proportion of .948. No further reliability or validity evidence is yet available for the SISS.

For the purposes of this study, the SISS has been adopted for observation of verbal interaction behavior. That is, the categories which pertain to physical behaviors, such as touching and body movement, have been deleted. With these revisions, the measure then includes 15 major categories of verbal interactional behavior (see Table 4). Specific behavioral descriptions of each category and criteria for scoring are provided in the SISS Scoring Manual (see Appendix D). The verbal interactional behavior of each subject was recorded on scoring summary sheets (see Appendix E).

#### Additional Dependent Measures

Latency time measures were taken in order to gather information about time orientation in the context of verbal interactional behavior. Latency I is the time from the beginning of the social influence session to the first influence attempt. Latency II is the time from the first rejection of candy to the next influence attempt. This second latency is basically a measure of the time it takes subjects to recover from initial rejection of their influence efforts.

Table 4

The Major Categories of the Social  
Interaction Scoring System

---

Image Control: Assertive-Yielding Behaviors

1. Verbal Ascendency-Dominance
2. Physical Ascendency-Dominance
3. Provides Positive Structure
4. Provides Negative Structure
5. Asks for Structure
6. Abasement
7. Submission-Compliance

Sanctions Control: Positive and Negative Affective Behaviors

8. Negative Sanctions
9. Positive Sanctions

Resource Control: Interdependency Behavior

10. Interdependency Strategies
11. Resource Management

Perception Control: Presentation of Information about Reality

12. Explanation
13. Deceptions
14. Manipulation

Other: Influence Attempts not able to be Classified

---

A Post-Experimental Questionnaire (see Appendix F) was given at the end of the experimental procedures in order to assess (1) the motivation of the subject, (2) the homogeneity of confederate behavior, and (3) the willingness of the subject to participate in similar future experiments. In addition, a candy consumption rate was measured in order to observe the extent to which subjects utilized modeling (eating candy) as an influence attempt.

### Procedures

The experimental procedures for this study were inspired by the observational methods used by Braginsky (1970) and Savasta (1977) in their studies of social influence behavior and Machiavellianism. In these studies, subjects in the role of the influencer tried to get other subjects, target persons, to eat bitter tasting crackers. The subjects in the present study were involved in a social influence situation in the role of influencer, while student confederates took the role of the target person. In a small pilot of experimental procedures, it was found that women of college age were unwilling to encourage others to eat bitter crackers; therefore that procedure was abandoned. Instead, the subjects were asked to influence the target person to eat as many pieces of candy as possible in a short period of time. The confederate was instructed to eat the first piece of candy offered and to refuse any more for the duration of the session. Subjects were debriefed and administered the remaining dependent measures.

### Experimental Treatment

The subject was greeted in the waiting room and asked to sign a consent form to participate in the study. The experimenter then invited the woman into the experimental room, which was set up with two chairs and a small table with candy on it. The room was equipped with video cameras which were not being utilized. The subjects were reassured that they were not being filmed. The room had a one-way mirror, behind which was a small observation booth. The women were advised that the session would be audio-recorded from the observation booth. The subject was asked if she had heard anything about the experiment. Those subjects who had previous knowledge about the eating task were excluded from the study and replaced by new subjects. The experimenter then said:

I'm really glad you made it today to help us with this study. We're interested in learning about how women use their power and influence to get other people to do things. We have studied men before, but as yet we just don't know how effective and assertive a woman can be. So that we can learn about how women influence people, we're going to ask you to try to influence someone here today. I'd like you to try to influence another student to eat as many pieces of candy as possible in a three-minute period. That shouldn't be too hard, since most people enjoy M&M's. Here, would you like to try one first? We know from previous research that the average male college student can get someone to eat about six to eight pieces of candy in three minutes. We just don't know how influential a woman would be in this situation. Will you participate in the study? I don't care how you do it, just as long as you try very hard during the short three-minute period. To help motivate you to try harder, we'll pay you 50¢ for every piece of candy you get this other person to eat. So, if you do as well as the college men, you could make about \$3.00 in just three minutes, or even more if you are very good at it. Also, it's very important that during the three minutes you not wander off course and talk to your partner about other things. Your partner is another student who has been recruited from class, just like you, and has been taking a test in another room. This person

doesn't know anything about this experiment, except that he/she is supposed to come in and talk to you for three minutes. Do you have any questions? I'll bring in the other student now. You try as hard as you can to get this person to eat as many pieces of candy as possible in three minutes. And remember, we don't care how you do it. You can do anything you want. Okay? I'll be right back.

The experimenter brought the confederate into the room and introduced her to the subject. She told them that she would be back in three minutes. The experimenter then went to the next room and observed the social influence situation through a one-way mirror. This was so that any irregularities in the procedure could be noted. After three minutes the experimenter returned to the room and terminated the session. The confederate was excused and the subject debriefed and paid the promised amount, 50¢. The subject was then taken to another room and given the TAIS.

### Debriefing

Desensitization (Holmes, 1976) is defined as "the process of helping subjects to deal with new information about themselves acquired as a consequence of the behaviors they exhibited during the experiment" (p. 868). Desensitization was particularly relevant to this study, since subjects risked exhibiting behaviors during the social influence situation which could have caused them embarrassment, guilt, or self-doubt. Some behaviors exhibited may not have been in keeping with the subject's previous self-conceptions. Therefore, the experimenter assured the subject that her behavior was largely the result of the experimental situation and was not abnormal or unusual under these circumstances. The subjects were "dehoaxed" as to the

nature of the confederate, the manipulated resistance to their influence attempts and the basic improbability of their influence efforts being successful. Subjects were asked to maintain confidentiality about the experimental task and made aware that "leaking" information to other students might bias the research conclusions.

### Training the Confederates

Three undergraduate research assistants (two female, one male) were trained as confederates. They were instructed to remain responsive and warm throughout the sessions and to gently resist all influence attempts. In addition to accepting only one piece of candy concurrent with the first influence attempt, they were asked to conceal their real college major (Psychology) so that the subject would not suspect their role as a confederate. No conversation was to be initiated by the confederates, but they were to respond to the subject in a way that would not pull her off-task into tangential conversation. The confederates went through a training period until the required behaviors and attitudes were demonstrated.

### Scoring the Social Influence Behavior

The audiotapes were transcribed and scored according to the conditions explained in the SISS scoring manual (see Appendix D). The following is a randomly chosen sample of one of the three-minute verbal interactions between the confederate and subject. This will serve as an example of an actual scored interaction.

Sample Protocol

TP = Target Person (the confederate)

I = Influencer (the subject)

George, this is Julia.

TP: Hi, Julia.

I: Hi.

I'll be back in three minutes.

I: Don't I know you?

TP: I think so, you're familiar to me.

I: You look familiar to me.

TP: Your name's familiar, too.

I: Oh, really?

TP: Yeah.

I: Where do I know you from?

TP: Maybe from one of the classes on campus.

I: I don't think so. Are you LDS?

TP: Uh huh.

I: Are you? What ward are you in?

TP: The third.

I: Oh, I'm in the third ward.

TP: Oh, okay.

I: Is that where I've seen you?

TP: Probably.

I: Wait a sec. Is your girlfriend Susan?

TP: Uh huh.

I: Okay, you're in Carol B.'s class.



TP: Uh huh.

I: Okay. That's where it was at. That's where I saw you.  
What are you doing here? (8c)

TP: I just volunteered for a psychology experiment.

I: Oh, okay. Do you want to eat some of that candy? (5b)

TP: Okay, sure.

I: Want some more? (5b)

TP: Not right now, thank you.

I: Are you sure? (5b) They're really good. (5b)

TP: Uh huh.

I: Have you tried the brown ones? (5b)

TP: I tried a green one right now.

I: Really?

TP: Uh huh.

I: Do you want to try a brown one? (5b)

TP: They taste the same, don't they?

I: Probably not. (13a) They say the different colors do different things to you, you know. (13a)

TP: Really?

I: Yeah.

TP: I didn't know that.

I: Yeah, do you want to try it? (5b)

TP: A

I: Go ahead, really, help yourself. (1) Feel free. (1)

Key: 8c = Suspicion or questioning motives  
5b = Asks for suggestions, actions toward goals  
13a = Commissive lying  
1 = Verbal ascendancy-dominance

TP: We can have these if we want? They're here for us?

I: Yeah.

TP: Oh, okay.

I: So go ahead and eat them, okay? (1)

TP: I don't think so.

I: Why, don't you like them? (8c)

TP: Yeah, I like M&Ms.

I: You must like peanut ones better, is that it? (8c)

TP: No, I like plain ones better, as a matter of fact.

I: How come you don't want to eat them? (8c) Do you feel stupid? (8c)  
You don't want to eat in front of me? (8c)

TP: No, that's not it. I just don't feel like an M&M right now.

I: Oh, really.

TP: Uh huh.

I: Well, I'm supposed to persuade you to eat these M&Ms. (12)

TP: Uh huh. How are you supposed to do that?

I: However I can. (12) But I'm just asking you will you eat the M&Ms? (5b) Or I'll beat your face in. (2) No, I'm just joking. (3d)

TP: No, thank you.

I: You mean you're not going to eat any? (8a)

TP: I don't think so.

I: Now I'm doing this psychology experiment and you're not going to eat these? (8a)

Key: 1 = Verbal ascendancy-dominance  
 8c = Suspicion or questioning of motives  
 12 = Explanation  
 5b = Asks for suggestions, actions toward goals  
 2 = Physical ascendancy-dominance  
 3d = Clarification  
 8a = Verbal antagonism

- TP: Is this the experiment we're in now?
- I: Well, yeah. And I'm supposed to get you to eat those candies. (12)
- TP: Uh huh. Well, I've had one.
- I: I know, I know. (8a) Don't you want more? (5b)
- TP: I don't think so, thank you.
- I: Why are you being so nice? (8c) Eat some! (1)
- TP: Would you like some?
- I: No, I don't. (4a) And you're supposed to eat them, not me. (3a)  
Okay? (5a) Won't you eat some, please. (6a) Please eat them! (6a)
- TP: No, thank you.
- I: Why, what did I do wrong? (6b)
- TP: No reason.
- I: Well, then, what's the big deal? (8c) There's no big deal,  
is there? (5a)
- TP: I don't think so.
- I: So why don't you just eat some more? (8c)
- TP: Oh, that's all right.
- I: Are you on a diet? (8c)
- TP: No.
- I: Watching your weight? (8c) You don't like chocolate. (8c)  
You're allergic to chocolate? (8c)
- TP: No. I like chocolate. I like M&Ms. I'm not on a diet.
- I: So, why don't you just have some more, okay? (5a)

Key: 12 = Explanation	4a = Disagreement
8a = Verbal antagonism	3a = Suggestions and actions toward goals
5b = Asks for suggestions, actions toward goals	5a = Asks for opinions, evaluations
8c = Suspicion, questioning motives	6a = Pleads, begs
1 = Verbal ascendancy-dominance	6b = Blames or belittles self

TP: No, thank you.

I: Hmm. If I eat more, will you eat one? (10)

TP: I don't think so.

I: Why? (8c) I can't understand that. (8a) How come you won't eat it? (8c)

TP: I just don't feel like an M&M today.

I: Well, that doesn't matter. (8a) Just eat it anyway! (1) This is an experiment. (8a) You're supposed to go along with experiments, aren't you? (8a)

TP: I think so.

I: Now, if they would have told you to come in here and do something wouldn't you have done it? (8a) If they would have told you to come in here and eat the whole bowl of M&Ms, wouldn't you have eaten the whole bowl whether you felt like it or not? (8a)

TP: Probably.

I: Okay. I'm telling you. Eat the whole bowl of M&Ms! (1)

TP: Well, Doris didn't tell me to eat the M&Ms. She just told me to come in here.

I: So, I'm telling you to eat the M&Ms, doesn't that make any difference? (1)

Key: 10 = Interdependency strategies  
 8c = Suspicion or questioning motives  
 8a = Verbal antagonism  
 1 = Verbal ascendancy dominance

## CHAPTER IV

## RESULTS

The primary purposes were to investigate the potential associations between (1) feminine identity development and personality characteristics, (2) feminine identity development and social influence style, with same-versus opposite-sex partners, and (3) personality characteristics and social influence behavior. The literature review suggests that identity status is related to more complex personality functioning and effective interpersonal styles. Likewise, the literature suggests that personality characteristics may mediate the social influence behavior of women.

The data collection in the present study consisted of a personality measure, The Test of Attentional and Interpersonal Style (Nideffer, 1976), and a social influence situation in which female subjects, previously classified into four identity status groups (Marcia, 1966), were asked to influence a confederate (male or female) to eat pieces of candy. The confederates were instructed to refuse the candy after one piece, in order to maximize the number and variety of influence attempts. These behavioral observations were audio-taped, transcribed, and then scored using the Social Interaction Scoring System (Savasta, 1977). A post-experimental questionnaire was administered to assess the uniformity of experimental conditions and record the rate of candy consumption by subjects. Two latency times were taken from the tapes to measure the time to the subject's first

influence attempt and the recovery time from the first rejection to next influence attempt.

### Reliability of Social Measures

The social influence situations were tape-recorded, transcribed, and coded according to the categories within the Social Interaction Scoring System. The 80 protocols were coded by two raters, each blind to the identity status of the subject. Thirty protocols were randomly selected from the cases and scored by each rater. These 30 protocols were cross-coded in order to yield an estimate of the interrater reliability of the coding system.

Three indices were employed to assess interrater consensus. One index, based on agreement on category assignment, was computed by averaging the case-by-case percentages of agreement on social interaction categories. Interrater agreement on this index was 88%. A second percentage of agreement was computed using the ratio of the total number of agreements to the total number of scorable units coded. This index yielded 87% agreement. Pearson correlations, based on raw frequencies of category assignments, were computed as the third reliability index. The reliability coefficients ranged from .20 to .99, with a mean reliability of .82. The results are presented in Table 5. Likewise, the reliability of latency times, taken from the same 30 protocols, were computed using a Pearson correlation. The results are presented in Table 6.

Table 5  
Interrater Reliability on the Social  
Interaction Scoring System

N = 30

---

<u>Dimensions</u>	<u>Rater 1 with Rater 2</u>
Verbal Ascendancy - Dominance	.92
Physical Ascendancy - Dominance	.69
Positive Structure Provided	.98
Negative Structure Provided	.76
Asks for Structure	.95
Abasement	.95
Submission - Compliance	.88
<u>Total: Image Control</u>	.99
Negative Sanctions	.99
Positive Sanctions	---
<u>Total: Sanctions Control</u>	.94
Interdependency	.63
Resource Management	.42
<u>Total: Resource Control</u>	.78
Explanation	.82
Deception	.90
Manipulation	.90
<u>Total: Perception Control</u>	.94
Other	.20*
<u>Total Number of Social Interaction Responses</u>	.99

---

Mean Correlation = .82

Percentage of Agreement = 87%

---

\*With one exception, all  $r$ 's are significant  $p < .01$



Table 6  
Interrater Reliability on Latency  
Scores from Tapes

---

<u>Latency</u>	<u>Rater 1 with Rater 2</u>
Time to First Influence Attempt	.99*
Time from First Rejection to the Next Influence Attempt	.99*

---

\*Significant greater than  $p < .001$

These data suggest that the coding scheme used in the analysis of the social influence situations and the latency timing measures were scored in a reliable manner.

### Identity and Personality

The primary objective of this data analysis was to identify personality characteristics which distinguish between the four identity status groups. A functional discriminant analysis was used to identify predictors of these statuses. The purpose of discriminant analysis is to "weight and linearly combine the discriminating variables in some fashion so that the groups are forced to be as statistically distinct as possible" (Klecka, 1975, p. 435). This procedure yields a basic discriminant function (or factor) consisting of related variables which statistically differentiate between the various groups.

Table 7 summarizes standardized discriminant function coefficients, means, and standard deviations for the identity status groups, along with other relevant statistics. Two basic functions were derived from the personality subscales of the Test of Attentional and Interpersonal Style. Factor I consists of three discriminating variables, while Factor II represents a single variable.

While means and standard deviations are provided, the predictive relationship between the identity statuses and personality subscales is determined by a comparison of the group centroids (the mean discriminant function scores). A comparison of the group centroids was computed using Rao's V technique, a stepwise procedure which

Table 7

Discriminant Function, Means and Standard Deviations Between  
Identity Status and the Test of Attentional and  
Interpersonal Style: Factors I and II

Variable	Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficient	Identity Status							
		1		2		3		4	
		Diffusion		Foreclosure		Moratorium		Achievement	
		$\bar{X}$	sd	$\bar{X}$	sd	$\bar{X}$	sd	$\bar{X}$	sd
Factor I <sup>a</sup>									
Broad Internal Attentional Focus	-1.60	18.3	3.7	15.7	3.5	19.5	3.1	18.7	2.5
Information Processing	+1.14	43.5	7.4	43.3	7.4	45.3	6.3	47.4	5.8
Introversion	+.59	20.1	5.0	19.7	3.8	20.6	4.9	22.3	5.3
Factor II <sup>b</sup>									
Reduced Attention	-.45	26.5	4.8	28.3	3.4	24.3	5.4	24.7	5.0
Group Centroid									
(Mean Discriminant Score)		Factor I		Factor II					
		-.63		.72		-.70		.61	
		-.39		-.69		.38		.71	

<sup>a</sup>Eigenvalue = .51; Relative Percentage of Variance = 52; Canonical Correlation = .58;  
Total Rao's  $\bar{V}$  = 59.49, df (3, 76);  $p < .0003$ .

<sup>b</sup>Eigenvalue = .33; Relative Percentage of Variance = 34; Canonical Correlation = .50;  
Total Rao's  $\bar{V}$  = 29.76, df (3, 76);  $p < .02$ .

sequentially predicts a set of "best" discriminating variables from all the subscales. For Factor I, the total Rao's V for the three variable function (Rao's V = 59.49, df = 3, 76,  $p < .0003$ ), accounted for 52% of the relationship between identity status and personality. The relative percentage of the eigenvalue, a measure of the general importance of the function, provides this statistical information. The canonical correlation, another measure of the relationship between the function and identity status groups, can be interpreted like the correlation ratio eta in one-way analysis of variance. Squaring the canonical correlation provides an index of the proportion of variance in the discriminant function explained by the identity status categories. For Factor I, the canonical correlation between the discriminant function and identity status groups was .58 which explained 34% of the variance.

The direction of the individual variables within the function can be estimated by the standardized discriminant function coefficients. A positive coefficient indicates that as one moves from diffusion to achievement in identity development, the scores on the personality variable increase in magnitude. Negative coefficients indicate decreases in magnitude. Factor I consists of variables measuring the (a) ability to integrate ideas and think analytically, (b) a tendency to process a great deal of stimulus information, and (c) a capacity to be alone with thoughts and feelings without being the center of attention. Factor I appears to be measuring a social cognitive style of personality dealing with an analytic thought process. Group centroids suggest diffusion and moratorium status

women were similar but significantly different from foreclosure and achievement women. Examining the individual standardized coefficients, foreclosures showed the least capacity for integration of ideas and analytical thinking, while moratorium and achievement status women are better able to process large amounts of information and be alone with their thoughts and feelings.

For Factor II, which is comprised of the Reduced Attentional Focus subscale, a comparison of the group centroids was significant (Rao's  $V = 29.76$ ,  $df = 3$ ,  $76$ ,  $p < .02$ ). The relative percentage of the eigenvalue was 34%. The canonical correlation was .50, accounting for 25% of the variance. The data suggest that diffusion and foreclosure women, scoring higher on Reduced Attentional Focus, are more likely than moratorium and achievement status women to make errors in judgment due to underinclusion of pertinent data.

### Classification

In addition to the analytic aspects of discriminant analysis, a classification process has also been utilized. This classification technique assesses the degree to which the functions can be used to identify individuals, without known group membership, into their actual group. In this case, the question is to what extent we can correctly predict identity status when only personality variables are known. These data are summarized in Table 8. Using the Factor I and II discriminating variables from the Test of Attentional and Interpersonal Style, 56.25% of the college women were correctly classified with regard to identity status.

Table 8

Percentage of Women Correctly Classified by the  
Test of Attentional and Interpersonal Style  
on Discriminant Function

<u>Actual Group</u>	<u>Number of Cases</u>	<u>Predicted Group Membership</u>							
		<u>Diffusion</u>		<u>Foreclosure</u>		<u>Moratorium</u>		<u>Achievement</u>	
		<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>
Diffusion	20	<u>11</u>	<u>55.0</u>	4	20.0	3	15.0	2	10.0
Foreclosure	20	5	25.0	<u>12</u>	<u>60.0</u>	1	5.0	2	10.0
Moratorium	20	3	15.0	4	20.0	<u>10</u>	<u>50.0</u>	3	15.0
Achievement	20	1	5.0	4	20.0	3	15.0	<u>12</u>	<u>60.0</u>
Total	80								

Note: Percent of Cases Correctly Classified equals 56.25%.

In summary, with regard to the relationship between identity status and personality characteristics, two discriminant functions were identified. These data indicate that diffused and foreclosed women are inclined to possess less differentiated social cognition styles than are moratorium or achievement status women.

### Identity and Social Influence Behavior

The purpose of these data analyses were to determine if there is a relationship between identity development and social influence behavior. Specially, the objective was to identify patterns of social influence behavior which would distinguish between the four identity status groups. Separate analyses were computed for the total group and the two sex conditions using functional discriminant analyses. These data will be discussed in the following sections.

#### Total Group

A functional discriminant analysis computed for identity status and scores on the Social Interaction Scoring System yielded one significant factor ( $p < .05$ ). These data are summarized in Table 9. The discriminating variables in this factor include: (a) use of resource management, (b) deception strategies, with utilization of (c) manipulation, and (d) negative structure (i.e., disagreements and maintenance of contrary positions). The total of Rao's V for this four variable function (Rao's V = 36.14, df = 3, 76,  $p < .05$ ), accounted for 51.3% of the variance. The canonical correlation between the discriminant function and identity status groups was .47, which



Table 9

Discriminant Function, Means, and Standard Deviations on  
Identity Status and the Social Interaction Scoring  
System: Total Group

Variable	Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficient	Identity Status							
		1		2		3		4	
		Diffusion		Foreclosure		Moratorium		Achievement	
		$\bar{X}$	sd	$\bar{X}$	sd	$\bar{X}$	sd	$\bar{X}$	sd
Factor I <sup>a</sup>									
Resource Management	-1.14	.10	.31	.30	.80	.25	.91	---	---
Manipulation	+.88	---	---	.20	.52	.05	.22	---	---
Deception	-.72	1.85	3.0	1.20	2.26	1.70	4.48	.45	.82
Negative Structure Provided	+.53	.60	1.04	1.45	1.70	.75	1.11	1.30	1.89
Group Centroid (Mean Discriminant Score)									
	Factor I	-.59		.31		-.23		.51	

<sup>a</sup>Eigenvalue = .28; Relative Percentage of Variance = 51.3; Canonical Correlation = .47;  
Total Rao's  $\bar{V}$  = 36.14, df (3, 76);  $p < .05$ .

explained 22% of the variance. While four variables emerged on a significant social influence function, it should be noted that certain identity status women failed to engage in two of the four behaviors. Therefore, interpretation between the identity statuses are limited to only those groups which engaged in such behavioral attempts. Nonetheless, failure to use the behavior is important data in and of itself.

The standardized coefficients suggest that diffusion and foreclosure women are more likely than moratorium women to use strategies involving the depriving and offering of resources. Also, foreclosure and diffusion women are more likely to use deceptive strategies than moratorium and achievement women. With regard to manipulative strategies, moratorium individuals tend to utilize this style of influence more frequently than foreclosure individuals. As one moves from diffusion towards identity achievement, the utilization of negative structure increases.

The classification data for prediction of identity status using the discriminating variables in Factor I are presented in Table 10. The predictive success of these social influence behaviors for identifying identity status is 48.75%. These data offer evidence of a reasonably strong relationship between identity development and social influence behavior.

#### Female Condition

The purpose of this data analysis was to determine the relationship between identity development and the social influence behavior women utilized with other women. Under this experimental condition,

Table 10

Percentage of Women Correctly Classified by the  
Social Interaction Scoring System on  
Discriminant Function: Total Group

<u>Actual Group</u>	<u>Number of Cases</u>	<u>Predictive Group Membership</u>							
		<u>Diffusion</u>		<u>Foreclosure</u>		<u>Moratorium</u>		<u>Achievement</u>	
		<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>
Diffusion	20	<u>10</u>	<u>50.0</u>	1	5.0	3	15.0	6	30.0
Foreclosure	20	5	25.0	<u>11</u>	<u>55.0</u>	3	15.0	1	5.0
Moratorium	20	5	25.0	2	10.0	<u>9</u>	<u>45.0</u>	4	20.0
Achievement	20	5	25.0	2	10.0	4	20.0	<u>9</u>	<u>45.0</u>
Total	80								

Note: Percent of Group Cases Correctly Classified by the Social Interaction Scoring System = 48.75%.

subjects were paired with a female confederate in the social influence situation. A functional discriminant analysis yielded two functions. These data are summarized in Table 11.

Factor I was not statistically significant (Rao's  $V = 36.05$ ,  $df = 3, 76$ ,  $p < .1140$ ), with the eigenvalue accounting for 67% of the variance. When females were matched with females, only fore-closure individuals used manipulative influence strategies. Fore-closed women were more likely than diffusion status females to use resource management strategies, while neither moratorium or identity achievement women used this type of social influence behavior. The advanced statuses used more "other" strategies, indicating that they displayed more exhaustive repertoires of behavior than were included in the present scoring system. Likewise, deceptive strategies were more likely to be used as identity status increases. Only diffusion women utilized positive sanctions (positive affect statements) with their female partners. The lower identity statuses tended to use more positive structuring of the influence situation, while foreclosed and moratorium women employed more frequent ascendancy-dominance strategies.

The classification data for the female condition are presented in Table 12. The predictive success of these social influence behaviors, which were used with females, for identifying identity status is 60%. These factors are particularly successful (80% correct classification) with moratorium individuals.

In summary, in interacting with other women, diffusion status females were observed to be least domineering, directive, and

Table 11

Discriminant Function, Means, and Standard Deviations on  
Identity Status and the Social Interaction  
Scoring System: Female Condition

Variable	Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficient	Identity Status							
		1		2		3		4	
		Diffusion		Foreclosure		Moratorium		Achievement	
		$\bar{X}$	sd	$\bar{X}$	sd	$\bar{X}$	sd	$\bar{X}$	sd
Factor I <sup>a</sup>									
Manipulation	-2.4	---	---	.10	.32	---	---	---	---
Resource Management	+1.70	.10	.32	.30	.95	---	---	---	---
Other	+1.0	.20	.42	.20	.63	.10	.32	.30	.67
Deception	+1.0	1.60	3.13	1.60	2.80	.70	1.25	.50	.97
Positive Structure Provided	-.88	6.60	5.00	7.40	7.63	4.80	2.70	5.90	8.10
Positive Sanctions	+.82	.20	.42	---	---	---	---	---	---
Verbal Ascendency-Dominance	-.66	1.10	1.85	3.70	2.45	3.50	4.70	2.00	3.33
Group Centroid (Mean Discriminant Score)	Factor I	1.42		-.87		-.57		.01	

<sup>a</sup>Eigenvalue = .97; Relative Percentage of Variance = 67; Canonical Correlation = .70;  
Total Rao's  $V = 36.05$ ,  $df (3, 76)$ ;  $p < .1140$ .

Table 12

Percentage of Women Correctly Classified by the Social  
Interaction Scoring System on Discriminant  
Function: Female Condition

<u>Actual Group</u>	<u>Number of Cases</u>	<u>Predicted Group Membership</u>							
		<u>Diffusion</u>		<u>Foreclosure</u>		<u>Moratorium</u>		<u>Achievement</u>	
		<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>
Diffusion	10	<u>5</u>	50.0	1	10.0	1	10.0	3	30.0
Foreclosure	10	0	0.0	<u>5</u>	50.0	3	30.0	2	20.0
Moratorium	10	0	0.0	1	10.0	<u>8</u>	80.0	1	10.0
Achievement	<u>10</u>	0	0.0	1	10.0	3	30.0	<u>6</u>	60.0

Note: Percent of Cases Correctly Classified by the Social Interaction Scoring System when matched with a Female Confederate = 60%.

opinionated, while offering occasional positive affect but seldom drawing upon physical resources to encourage the cooperation of another woman. Foreclosure women were manipulative and domineering in their interaction style, while using physical resources to influence others. In contrast to this domineering style of foreclosure women, moratorium and identity achievement females demonstrated a more subtle social interaction style. Both moratorium and achievement women utilized subtle deceptions of a non-manipulative nature. For example, these women would use small untruths to enhance the attractiveness of the M&M's. Further evidence of the non-manipulative style of these women is observed in their low use of physical resources to influence the other to eat candy. The complexity of identity achievement women can also be seen in the higher amount of non-scorable interaction behaviors.

### Male Condition

The purpose of this data analysis was to determine the relationship between identity development and the social influence behavior women utilize with men. Under this experimental condition, subjects were paired with a male confederate in the social influence situation. A functional discriminant analysis yielded two functions. These data are summarized in Table 13. A comparison of group centroids for Factor I, which represents interdependency strategies, was significant (Rao's  $V = 37.97$ ,  $df = 3, 76$ ,  $p < .003$ ). The relative percentage of the eigenvalue was 79%. The canonical correlation was .75, which accounted for 56% of the variance. These data suggest that



Table 13

Discriminant Function, Means, and Standard Deviations on  
Identity Status and the Social Interaction Scoring  
System: Male Condition

Variable	Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficient	Identity Status							
		1		2		3		4	
		Diffusion		Foreclosure		Moratorium		Achievement	
		$\bar{X}$	sd	$\bar{X}$	sd	$\bar{X}$	sd	$\bar{X}$	sd
<u>Factor I<sup>a</sup></u>									
Interdependency	+1.07	---	---	---	---	.10	.32	.60	.70
<u>Factor II<sup>b</sup></u>									
Manipulation	+.74	---	---	.30	.67	.10	.32	---	---
Negative Structure Provided	+.67	.50	.71	1.60	1.84	.70	1.06	1.30	2.06
Abasement	+.65	1.70	1.88	4.20	5.87	2.20	2.86	3.10	4.09
Explanation	+.39	1.00	1.15	2.10	2.60	1.10	1.45	3.30	3.47
<hr/>									
Group Centroid (Mean Discriminant Score)	Factor I	-.06		-.34		-.50		1.5	
	Factor II	-.76		.83		-.51		.43	

<sup>a</sup>Eigenvalue = 1.25; Relative Percentage of Variance = 79; Canonical Correlation = .75;  
Total Rao's  $V$  = 37.97,  $df$  (3, 76);  $p$  < .003.

<sup>b</sup>Eigenvalue = .30; Relative Percentage of Variance = 19; Canonical Correlation = .48;  
Total Rao's  $V$  = 10.35,  $df$  (3, 76);  $p$  < .41.

cooperation and interdependency behaviors were used more frequently with males with the moratorium and achievement women. Indeed, neither diffusion nor foreclosure women engaged in any form of interdependency behavior.

The discriminating variables on Factor II include manipulation, provision of negative structure, abasement of self and explanation. A comparison of group centroids was insignificant (Rao's  $V = 10.35$ ,  $df = 3, 76$ ,  $p < .41$ ). The relative percentage of the eigenvalue was 19%. The canonical correlation was .48, accounting for 23% of the variance. These data suggest that as one progresses towards identity achievement, there is an increasing tendency to use manipulative strategies with males, particularly when differentiating between foreclosure and moratorium individuals. Likewise, with increases in identity status there is a tendency to provide more negative structure or to maintain contrary positions, as well as increased use of self-abasement as a way of influencing a male. Women in the advanced statuses also have a greater tendency to use truthful, straightforward explanations as a way of influencing men than do women in the lower identity statuses. Although this factor is insignificant, it is of interest since the discriminating variables generally resemble stereotypic sex-role behavior expected of females with males.

The classification data for the male condition are presented in Table 14. The predictive success of these social influence behaviors, which were used with males, for correctly identifying identity status is 57.5%. These functions were particularly successful (90% correct classification) with diffusion women. However, there was

Table 14

Percentage of Women Correctly Classified by the Social  
Interaction Scoring System on Discriminant  
Function: Male Condition

<u>Actual Group</u>	<u>Number of Cases</u>	Predicted Group Membership							
		<u>Diffusion</u>		<u>Foreclosure</u>		<u>Moratorium</u>		<u>Achievement</u>	
		<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>
Diffusion	10	<u>9</u>	90.0	0	0.0	1	10.0	0	0.0
Foreclosure	10	3	30.0	<u>6</u>	60.0	0	0.0	1	10.0
Moratorium	10	6	60.0	2	20.0	<u>2</u>	20.0	0	0.0
Achievement	10	1	10.0	3	30.0	0	0.0	<u>6</u>	60.0
Total	40								

Note: Percentage of Grouped Cases Correctly Classified by the Social Interaction Scoring System when matched with a male confederate = 57.50%.

little success in discriminating the moratorium women, many of whom were incorrectly classified as diffusion.

In summary, when women interact with men, higher identity status females are more inclined to maintain an interdependency interaction style which includes equal distribution of advantages and disadvantages. Further, higher identity statuses may be more predictive of stereotypic sex-role behavior.

### Analyses of Variance on Social Interaction

#### Measures and Latency Times

A series of equal n analyses of covariances, using a 2 (sex condition) x 4 (identity status) factorial were completed to examine group differences and interactions on the subtotals (raw frequencies) of the Social Interaction Scoring System. Identical analyses were performed with the two latency measures. In all analyses, age was held as a covariate. Latency I is the time from the beginning of the social influence session to the first influence attempt. Latency II is the time from the first rejection of candy to the next influence attempt. These data are summarized in Table 15. The means are presented in Tables 16 and 17.

For the Image Control measure, the main effects for sex of confederate and identity status failed to reach an acceptable level of significance as did their interactions. However, there was a non-significant trend ( $p < .07$ ) for the sex condition, suggesting that more Image Control attempts are used with males than females. Across both male and female conditions, foreclosure women employed more

Table 15  
Analyses of Variance on Total Scores and Latency Measures

<u>Dependent Variable</u>	<u>Main Effects</u>		<u>Interaction</u>	<u>Covariate</u>
	<u>Condition</u>	<u>Identity</u>	<u>Condition X Identity</u>	<u>Age</u>
Total: Image Control	3.29 <sup>b</sup>	2.04	<1.00	3.91*
Total: Sanctions Control	4.17*	<1.00	1.37	<1.00
Total: Resource Control	<1.00	1.09	1.76	3.52 <sup>a</sup>
Total: Perception Control	<1.00	<1.00	<1.00	<1.00
Total Number of Social Interaction Responses	4.56*	1.90	1.09	1.94
Latency Time I	<1.00	<1.00	1.13	<1.00
Latency Time II	<1.00	<1.00	2.59 <sup>a</sup>	<1.00

\*Significant greater than  $p < .05$ .

<sup>a</sup>Significant greater than  $p < .06$ .

<sup>b</sup>Significant greater than  $p < .07$ .

Table 16

Mean Frequencies on the Total Categories of the  
Social Interaction Scoring System

<u>Category</u>	<u>Condition</u>	<u>Identity Status</u>			
		<u>Diffusion</u>	<u>Foreclosure</u>	<u>Moratorium</u>	<u>Achievement</u>
Image Control	Female	13.80	19.00	14.20	14.40
	Male	14.30	27.50	17.70	22.30
Sanctions Control	Female	3.50	5.60	3.00	3.20
	Male	4.40	5.60	5.30	9.30
Resource Control	Female	.60	1.20	.40	.10
	Male	.10	.30	.60	.60
Perception Control	Female	3.20	4.10	2.30	1.30
	Male	3.10	3.20	3.90	3.70
Total Number of Social Interactions	Female	21.30	30.00	20.00	19.30
	Male	22.00	36.60	27.50	36.10

Table 17  
Mean Latency Times

<u>Latency</u>	<u>Condition</u>	<u>Diffusion</u>	<u>Identity Status</u>		
			<u>Foreclosure</u>	<u>Moratorium</u>	<u>Achievement</u>
Time to the First Influence Attempt	Female	16.20	18.00	6.10	18.10
	Male	18.90	8.50	16.30	15.90
Time from the First Rejection to Next Influence Attempt	Female	5.70	17.10	5.70	21.90
	Male	25.20	5.40	23.00	2.20

Note: All times are reported in seconds.



image control responses than the other statuses, although this difference was not significant. The covariate of age was significant for Image Control responses, suggesting that differences in how women present themselves along an assertive-yielding continuum may be related to age. For the Sanctions Control measure, a significant main effect for sex of confederate was found ( $p < .05$ ). Women used significantly more Sanctions Control (positive or negative affect statements) strategies with the male than with the female confederate. Similarly, a significant main effect for sex of confederate was found for Total Number of Social Interaction Responses ( $p < .05$ ). Regardless of identity status, more social interaction responses were used with a male partner than with another female. Again, more overall interactions were scored for foreclosures, although this difference was not significant. For Resource Control behaviors, there emerged a nonsignificant ( $p < .06$ ) but noteworthy relationship between age and the use of resources in influence attempts. All other mean comparisons across identity status groups and sex conditions, along with interactions, were nonsignificant.

The analysis of mean comparisons for Latency Times yielded no significant main effects or interactions. However, the interaction for Latency II approaches significance ( $p < .06$ ). Examining the raw means, it appears that foreclosure and achievement women take less time to recover from rejection of their influence attempts with males than with females. Conversely, diffusion and moratorium women recover much more quickly with females than with males.

In summary, it appears that the differences in identity status groups were not significant for subcategories of the Social Interaction Scoring System. However, differences did emerge for the sex of confederate condition for Image Control, Sanctions Control, and Total Social Interaction Behaviors. Age was related to Image and Resource Control behaviors.

### Personality and Social Influence Behavior

The purpose of this analysis was to determine the relationship between personality variables, as measured by the Test of Attentional and Interpersonal Style and social influence behavior, as measured by the Social Interaction Scoring System. A factor analysis was completed to identify potential patterns or relationships between personality and social influence behavior. In the factor analysis procedure an initial correlation matrix between variables is generated, followed by extraction of initial factors which are then rotated to yield the most simple and interpretable factors (Kim, 1975). In the present analysis, a varimax rotation was performed, yielding three orthogonal (independent) factor structures. These data are summarized in Table 18.

Factor I consists of nine variables from the Test of Attentional and Interpersonal Style. No categories from the Social Interaction Scoring System are included in this factor, although the factor accounts for 51.5% of the variance. This factor suggests that individuals who maintain high self-esteem and perceive of themselves as being in control of interpersonal situations also process a wide

Table 18

Factor Analysis on the Test of Attentional and Interpersonal  
Style and the Social Interaction Scoring System

<u>Variables</u>	<u>Factors</u>		
	<u>I: Perceived Inter- personal Effectiveness</u>	<u>II: Impulsiveness and Confusion</u>	<u>III: Domineering Social Influence Style</u>
<u>Test of Attentional and Interpersonal Style</u>			
Broad External Attentional Focus (BET)	.52		
Overloaded by External Stimuli (OET)		.71	
Broad Internal Attentional Focus (BIT)	.73		
Overloaded by Internal Stimuli (OIT)		.71	
Reduced Attentional Focus (RED)		.66	
Information Processing (INFP)	.77		
Behavior Control (BCON)		.51	
Control Scale (CON)	.85		
Self-Esteem (SES)	.77		
Physical Orientation (P/O)	.57		
Obsessive (OBS)		.37	
Extroversion (EXT)	.72		
Intellectual Expression (IEX)	.69		
Negative Affect Expression (NAE)		.30	
Positive Affect Expression (PAE)	.44		
<u>Social Interaction Scoring System</u>			
Verbal Ascendency-Dominance			.68
Physical Ascendency-Dominance			.49
Positive Structure Provided			.47
Abasement			.47
Negative Sanctions			.54
Resource Management			.59

Note: Percentage of Shared Variance: Factor I = 51.5%; Factor II = 26.6%; Factor III = 21.9%.

variety of information from both internal and external sources. At the same time, they maintain a high self-perception of extroversion, intellectual expression, and participation in physical activities. This factor is labelled Perceived Interpersonal Effectiveness. Factor II consists of six variables from the personality measure and accounts for 26.6% of the shared variance. This factor appears to be measuring impulsive tendencies, associated with confusion and resulting in reduced attention. Factor II is called Impulsiveness and Confusion. Factor III consists of six social interaction categories and no personality variables. This factor accounts for 21.9% of the shared variance. The six behaviors loading on this factor represent a domineering, highly self-abusive, guilt-inducing social influence style. This factor is called Domineering Social Influence Style. Assuming the independence of the rotated factors, the data do not suggest a relationship between personality and social interaction behaviors. That is, personality does not predict observable social influence style.

A series of equal n analyses of covariance, using a 2 (sex) x 4 (identity status) factorial, were performed on the three factors. Scores were derived using a factor score procedure which weights each variable according to its factor structure weight. These factor scores are reported in two score modalities. The data for these analyses are presented in Tables 19 and 20. For Factor I, no significant main effects or interactions emerged. Factor II approached significance ( $p < .06$ ), suggesting that age is related to a personality style which includes being overloaded by internal and external

Table 19  
Analysis of Variance on Derived Factors

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Main Effects</u>		<u>Interaction</u>	<u>Covariate</u>
	<u>Condition</u>	<u>Identity</u>	<u>Condition X Identity</u>	<u>Age</u>
Factor I: Perceived Interpersonal Effectiveness	<1.00	1.37	<1.00	<1.00
Factor II: Impulsiveness and Confusion	<1.00	1.80	1.64	3.57 <sup>a</sup>
Factor III: Domineering Social Influence Style	3.70*	2.57 <sup>a</sup>	<1.00	1.78

\*Significant greater than  $p < .05$ .

<sup>a</sup>Significant greater than  $p < .06$ .

Table 20

Mean Factor Scores from Analysis of Variance of Derived Factors

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Condition</u>	<u>Identity Status</u>			
		<u>Diffusion</u>	<u>Foreclosure</u>	<u>Moratorium</u>	<u>Achievement</u>
Factor I: Perceived Interpersonal Effectiveness	Female	-0.14	-0.64	0.31	0.14
	Male	-0.05	0.01	0.01	0.36
Factor II: Impulsiveness and Confusion	Female	-0.12	0.58	0.19	-0.48
	Male	0.14	0.15	-0.39	-0.07
Factor III: Domineering Social Influence Style	Female	-0.42	0.37	-0.34	-0.38
	Male	-0.23	0.51	0.25	0.24

stimuli, reduced attentional focus, impulsivity, worrying, and negative affect expression. Factor III was significant for the sex condition ( $p < .05$ ) and approached significance for identity ( $p < .06$ ). This social influence style, which included verbal and physical ascendancy-dominance, the provision of positive structure, self-abasement, maintenance of contrary positions, and use of resources to influence, was employed more with males than females. There was a tendency for foreclosure women to utilize this style more than women in other statuses, regardless of the sex condition.

In summary, the data suggest no relationship between personality and social influence behaviors. The domineering social influence style identified by Factor III was used more frequently with males than females, and appeared to be more common among foreclosure women. Finally, Factor II was related to the age of the subject.

### Experimental Conditions

A series of equal  $n$  analyses of covariance using a 2 (sex)  $\times$  4 (identity status) factorial were performed to assess group differences and interactions on responses from the Post-Experimental Questionnaire. These data are summarized in Table 21. Across identity status groups and sex conditions, only one significant difference was found. When subjects were asked if they would be willing to participate in a similar experiment again, more subjects in the male condition agreed to do so than those in the female condition ( $p < .05$ ).

In summary, there were no differences in subject motivation, confederate warmth or candy consumption rate, regardless of sex of



Table 21  
Analyses of Variance on Experimental Conditions  
and Candy Consumption Rate

<u>Dependent Variable</u>	<u>Main Effects</u>		<u>Interaction</u>	<u>Covariate</u>
	<u>Condition</u>	<u>Identity</u>	<u>Condition X Identity</u>	<u>Age</u>
Subject Motivation	<1.00	<1.00	1.70	2.34
Willingness to Participate Again	4.58*	1.38	<1.00	2.43
Confederate Warmth	<1.00	<1.00	1.61	<1.00
Candy Consumption Rate	<1.00	<1.00	<1.00	<1.00

\*Significant greater than  $p < .05$ .

confederate or subject age. Willingness to participate again was affected by the sex of the confederate, but not by identity status subject's age. These findings suggest homogeneity of experimental conditions and provide assurance that the treatment was highly similar for all subjects.

## CHAPTER V

### DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study has been to investigate the potential relationships between (1) feminine identity development and personality characteristics, (2) identity and social influence behavior, with same-versus opposite-sex partners, and (3) personality characteristics and social influence behavior. It has been speculated from a review of the current literature, that identity status may be associated with more complex personality functioning and effective interpersonal styles. Likewise, it has been hypothesized that personality characteristics may mediate the social influence behavior of women.

Female college students were classified as to identity status and then observed interacting in a social influence situation with either a male or female confederate. Social influence behavior was scored using a predetermined social interaction rating system. Personality characteristics were assessed with an objective self-report measure. These data were then analyzed using a series of functional discriminant analyses, analyses of covariance, and a factor analysis.

#### Major Findings

##### Identity Development and Personality

It was hypothesized that the advanced identity statuses would be associated with more complex and differentiated personality attributes.

A discriminant functional analysis on the identity statuses and the TAIS did indeed yield a pattern of personality characteristics that significantly differentiated between the higher and the lower identity statuses.

Factor I, which appears to be measuring a social cognitive style, consists of variables measuring: (1) the ability to integrate ideas and think analytically, (2) the tendency to process a great deal of stimulus information and (3) a capacity to be alone with thoughts and feelings. Foreclosure and identity achievement women were significantly different from the diffusion and moratorium women with regard to this pattern of social-cognitive style. Examining the individual subscales of Factor I, foreclosures were least able to integrate and analyze ideas from several different areas, while the advanced statuses were most able to process large amounts of information from busy and complex environments, and to be alone with their thoughts and feelings. Factor I consisted of one variable, reduced attentional focus. Diffusion and foreclosure women were differentiated from the advanced statuses by the tendency to narrow their attention to the point of excluding important and relevant information.

These findings suggest a relationship between identity and personality, specifically the cognitive and attentional aspects of personality functioning. This ability to process large amounts of information from complex environments and process it independently, appears to be the essence of what is necessary to successfully negotiate the period of "psycho-social moratorium." The task of

sorting widely diverse life options, with the goal of making meaningful commitments, requires a tolerance for periods of "being unable to opt for one side or another and managing with an enormous expenditure of energy to keep all possibilities open" (Josselson, 1973, p. 34). Moratorium is also characterized by periods of "endless introspection" and "internal war" (Josselson, 1973, p. 33). It would appear that the information processing and contemplative abilities demonstrated by the advanced statuses, would be critical to weathering the turmoil of the moratorium stage and advancing to identity achievement.

It could be suggested that these cognitive abilities may be prerequisite to movement into the advanced identity stages. This becomes a more intriguing thought when the cognitive style of the foreclosures is considered. Foreclosures tended to be least capable of integrative and analytic thinking and most likely to narrow their attentional focus and exclude task-relevant information. By definition, foreclosures bypass a period of crisis and self-exploration on the way to making commitments. The cognitive approach of the foreclosure women may be to selectively exclude new information that could cause disharmony, internal conflict, and ambivalence, and thus avoid the plunge into identity diffusion or moratorium.

Two distinct cognitive styles have emerged in this analysis. The first, characterized by receptivity and ability to process what is perceived analytically, is associated with the advanced statuses. The second, characterized by a generalized narrowing of attention to external information and reduced ability to think analytically, is

associated with the lower statuses. It is notable that of the 17 subscales of the TAIS, the variables that discriminated significantly are those concerned with attentional focus and information processing. While much attention has been given to personality variables, very little attention has been given to the cognitive dimensions distinctive of the identity statuses. Schenkel's (1975) study of field independence, the only investigation of specific cognitive variables and identity in college women, does not support the trend of the present findings. In that investigation, the stable statuses were found to be more field independent than the diffusions and moratoriums. However, college males in the advanced statuses were found to be more cognitively "reflective" (to take longer and make fewer errors in problem solving) than the more "impulsive" diffusions and foreclosures. There appears to be emerging evidence that there are cognitive style differences among the identity statuses, and that the advanced statuses tend to perform better on cognitive tasks.

It is noteworthy that well-documented personality differences among the identity statuses, in such areas as self-esteem, locus of control, or anxiety, were not supported in this study. This might be attributed to variability in dependent measures. The TAIS, which focuses mainly on attention, control, and interpersonal aspects of personality, may not be as sensitive to these variables as the more specialized instruments (e.g., I-E scales, Welsh Anxiety Scales) that are typically used in identity status research.

#### Identity and Social Influence Style

It was hypothesized that the advanced identity statuses might

demonstrate more complex repertoires of social influence strategies than the lower statuses. Further, it was predicted that different social influence behaviors might be employed when attempting to influence males and females. To address these questions, analyses were performed for the total group and the two sex conditions.

Total group. A pattern of behavior emerged in this analysis, in which identity diffusion and foreclosure women were differentiated from the women in the advanced statuses. The lower status women utilized more strategies involving the offering and depriving of resources, but identity achievement women never tried this type of influence attempt. Also, diffusion and foreclosure women utilized more deceptive strategies. Manipulation, used only by foreclosure and moratorium women, was used more frequently by the moratoriums. Finally, as one moves from diffusion toward identity achievement, the use of negative structure also increases.

The women in the lower statuses demonstrated a pattern of influence that was characterized by use of resources and deception. The women were told they would be paid for the candy eaten by the target person<sup>1</sup> so that monetary resources were available for bargaining. This money was used as expected, but these women also tried using personal resources such as information, kisses, candy, and playful withholding such as "I'll never speak to you again." Their deceptions also had a playful, child-like quality. They consistently

---

<sup>1</sup>A deceptive influence attempt on the part of the examiner.

told stories about the magical meanings of the M&M colors (e.g., "orange ones make you sexy, green ones mean you are weird"). These stories, which were the most common form of deception, appeared to be drawn from childhood experiences. Rather than using direct attempts or making clear, straightforward statements, these women remained once-removed by using a resource or deceptive ploy. Falbo (1977b) reports that college students concerned with social desirability tend to use indirect strategies such as these. Josselson (1973) describes foreclosure women as being very concerned with social approval, gaining their self-esteem through pleasing others, and having fun by being good. Remembering Josselson's (1973) description of foreclosure women as "psychologically childlike," the predominance of these strategies is not surprising.

Women in the advanced statuses provided more negative structure than women in the lower statuses. Attempts categorized as negative structure included direct contradictions, disagreements, and maintenance of contrary positions, without hostility or antagonism. These attempts require an ability to take a firm stand, without hostility towards the other, and a willingness to risk social disapproval. These qualities appear to be further demonstration of the internality of locus of control (Howard, 1975; Adams & Shea, 1979) and resistance to conformity (Toder & Marcia, 1973) found among identity achievement individuals, as well as the greater ego-development demonstrated by the advanced statuses (Adams & Shea, 1979).

Female condition. When women attempted to influence other women, again, a pattern of behavior emerged which differentiated



the higher from lower identity statuses. Although this discriminating factor did not reach statistical significance ( $p < .1140$ ), it demonstrates certain behavioral trends important to the present discussion. The strongest discriminating variable to emerge, manipulation, was only used by foreclosure women. Likewise, only foreclosure and identity diffusion women used resource management strategies and only identity diffusion women utilized positive sanctions. Also, foreclosure women attempted ascendancy-dominance strategies and positive sanctions more frequently than the other statuses.

What emerges here is a more negative influence style among the lower statuses. This style includes bargaining with resources, attributing responsibility for the influence attempt to another person, "buttering-up" or flattering the target person, and attempting to be authoritarian and domineering. Conversely, the foreclosures offered more positive suggestions, directive comments, opinions, and clarifications than the other women.

It has been shown that foreclosures are the more authoritarian of the statuses (Marcia & Friedman, 1970; Schenkel & Marcia, 1972), and perhaps this is due to their own introjection of parental values and ideas with little adolescent rebellion. In this type of family, if one is "good" and obeys, one avoids intergenerational conflict and parental disapproval. Thus, it is not surprising that an unlikely combination of authoritarian and helpful, pleasing strategies would be demonstrated by these women. In order to avoid direct conflict, an indirect, somewhat covert influence style, with the outward appearance of being very helpful and socially "appropriate"

has been utilized here with other women. At the same time, orders and commands are delivered with the expectation that the target person will "obey," as they themselves have learned to do.

The advanced statuses used no strategies involving manipulation, bargaining with resources or flattery and depended less on positive structure and authoritarian influence attempts. Identity achievement women used more strategies unable to be classified by the scoring system, demonstrating a wider repertoire of behaviors than the lower statuses. As identity status moved toward achievement, there was a greater tendency for the women to utilize deception. Initially, this may appear inconsistent. However, it again suggests that the advanced statuses utilize a broad repertoire of influence attempts that includes some less desirable strategies. This style appears different from that used by the lower statuses, which included primarily less desirable strategies.

Male condition. When women attempted to influence a male, in the social influence situation, two separate functions emerged which discriminated among the identity statuses. Factor I consisted of interdependency strategies, that is, attempts at compromise, cooperation and equal distribution of advantages and disadvantages (e.g., "I'll eat one for every one you eat"). These strategies were only used by the advanced statuses, and more frequently by identity achievement women.

Interdependency, which represents one of the highly respected values of our culture, is also the ideal resolution of male-female polarities. In Erikson's developmental stages, interdependency is

the thread which runs through the more advanced "crises" of intimacy and generativity. Out of the more narcissistic idealism of adolescence and moralism of childhood, develops a sense of ethics which enables the "I" focus to shift towards the "we". It appears that the women who are more advanced in identity development are demonstrating this shift in their influence attempts with a male. This finding was also supported by Savasta (1977) who found democratic or equalitarian strategies to be most common among later adolescents.

Factor II, although not significant ( $p < .41$ ) is most intriguing. In this pattern, as identity status progresses from foreclosure to moratorium, women utilize more manipulation and self-abasement strategies. Pleading, begging, whining, and asking for help by virtue of inadequacy are among the less socially desirable stereotypic sex-role behaviors females apparently use with males, especially when combined with manipulation. Savasta (1977) also found that late adolescent females frequently used self-abasing strategies with their male partners. Unfortunately, strategies communicating helplessness and inadequacy have been hypothesized to lower self-esteem (Johnson, 1976; Raven & Kruglanski, 1970) and make it more difficult to be seen as powerful and effective.

Conversely, this second factor also includes providing negative structure and explanation, two relatively desirable influence strategies. As one moves into the higher identity statuses, there is a greater tendency to disagree, contradict and maintain firm positions without hostility, as well as to offer straightforward

explanations. These strategies again support the notion of greater ego strength and maturity among the advanced statuses.

This combination of influence behaviors is difficult to interpret, but may be due to the lingering fear of women about being too powerful or behaving in ways inconsistent with sex-role expectations. Although one might logically expect the women in the advanced statuses to be less fearful, Orlofsky (1978) has shown that moratorium and achievement women demonstrate the highest scores on fear of success measures. In addition, the present sample was drawn from college women in a rural, conservative, religious community, where more traditional sex-role expectations for women are emphasized. It appears that the firm, straightforward, non-threatening strategies used by these women to get what they want, are tempered by a degree of self-abasement and child-like dependency. What is most interesting is that none of the self-abasing, pleading, whining influence attempts were tried with women confederates. Perhaps woman to woman, it was believed that these behaviors would simply not work.

Savasta (1977) who found similar patterns of women presenting seemingly "opposite faces," interprets this as a manipulative image control tactic. The coupling of straightforward, firm influence attempts with those that are helpless and child-like creates a contradictory image of who the woman really is. It also would appear to create some cognitive confusion about what message she is actually communicating. Unfortunately, this study did not address the effectiveness of the various strategies. There is reason to suspect that these double messages sent by women create confusion, mistrust,

and possibly guilt in their male partners, which potentially detracts from the women's effectiveness as influencers.

### Additional Social Influence Measures

An analysis of covariance was performed on frequencies of the various influence behaviors, as scored by the major categories of the SISS. There was a trend ( $p < .07$ ) for Image Control strategies, the assertive-yielding behaviors, to be used more frequently with men. Significantly ( $p < .05$ ) more Sanctions Control strategies, the positive and negative affect behaviors, were attempted with men. This pattern was consistent, in that more Total influence attempts were tried with the male confederate than with the female. The confounding effects of age were removed in this analysis for Image Control and Resource Control behaviors. When mean frequencies were combined, foreclosure and identity achievement women made far more total influence attempts with a male than the diffusion and moratorium women ( $F + A = 72.70$ ,  $D + M = 49.50$ ). This difference was not true for the female condition.

The late adolescent women in this study behaved notably different with a man than with another woman. They were very concerned about presentation of themselves along the assertive-submissive continuum and often presented conflicting, weak-strong messages. Likewise, they were more attentive, expressive, and affective towards the male, using both positive and negative emotional statements to get what they wanted. These behaviors again reflect the sex-role stereotype of women being more concerned about outward

appearances and "warmth and expressiveness" (Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson, & Rosenkrantz, 1972). However, it is notable that this behavior is demonstrated to a much greater extent with men than with another woman. In the comparisons between the male and female conditions there was a defensive shift into more stereotypic female behaviors.

In addition, the more stable statuses--foreclosure and identity achievement--were far more responsive to the male than the diffusion and moratorium women, utilizing many more influence attempts. Also, latency time data suggest that the stable statuses recovered more quickly from male rejection of their attempts than female rejection. Conversely, the diffusion and moratorium women recovered much faster from female rejection.

This finding is inconsistent with the hypotheses regarding the advanced statuses which has predominated this discussion. It appears that the stable statuses demonstrate less anxiety with the opposite sex and greater comfort with their interpersonal skills, allowing them to come back with the next attempt very quickly. The uncommitted statuses showed much more comfort and coping ability with women. It may also be that the foreclosure and identity achievement women were more motivated to respond to a male, since they attempted many more influence strategies.

It should be noted that the male confederate was an extremely attractive undergraduate, who by the standards of the community, represented the ideal in young men (e.g., physically attractive, masculine, polite, achievement-oriented, returned LDS missionary). The female confederates were, likewise, very attractive and stylish

young women, who may have been somewhat threatening to these subjects, who appear so concerned about their images. At least one subject remarked to the experimenter that the task would have been easier if the female confederate had not been so attractive. It is possible that having established some committed identity, regardless of the process, enabled these women not only to cope much better, but "turn on" with an attractive male, whereas the uncommitted statuses experienced far more ease and coping ability with women.

In addition, when asked if they would participate in this type of experiment again, more women in the male condition said they would do so, regardless of identity status. It appears that it was simply more rewarding to interact with an attractive male than with an attractive female.

### Social Influence Behavior and Personality

A factor analysis was performed on the TAIS and SISS to identify potential relationships or patterns between personality characteristics and social influence behavior. Three independent factors emerged. Factor I, Perceived Interpersonal Effectiveness, consisted of nine variables from the personality measure. Factor II, Impulsiveness and Confusion, consisted of six personality variables and no social interaction categories. This factor was found to be related to age in an analysis of covariance. Factor III, Domineering Social Influence Style, represented an authoritarian, self-abrasive, guilt-inducing influence style, which was used more by foreclosure women, and especially with the male confederate.



This influence style among foreclosure women was discussed previously. However, the more striking finding in these analyses is that, assuming the independence of these three rotated factors, there appears to be no relationship between personality and social influence behavior. This is contrary to the literature previously cited in which social influence styles are associated with psychological androgyny (Falbo, 1977a), conformity, and social desirability (Falbo, 1977b). These variables are clearly not measured on the TAIS. However, one might expect the attentional differences found among this group of women to be related to a specific interpersonal style of influence. Such a relationship was not substantiated by this analysis, and can only be cautiously inferred for the foreclosure women. Foreclosure women demonstrated reduced attentional focus and less analytical, integrative thinking style. They also emerged as the group which demonstrated a more negative Domineering influence style with the opposite sex.

The lack of a clear association between personality characteristics, as described on this self-report measure, and behavior under the experimental conditions, may be due to several factors. Perhaps the nature of this admittedly contrived and demanding task of persuading another person elicited social desirability effects. Several women spontaneously reported feeling some embarrassment, especially with the male confederate, which may have affected their typical manner of relating and elicited more socially comfortable behaviors.



It is possible that how these women say they behave, has little relevance to their behavior in actual social interactions, when a wide range of emotions are involved. In addition, this finding also leads to questions about the predictive validity of this personality measure, which appears to tap attentional and cognitive processes much more effectively than traditional personality characteristics.

### Conclusions

The findings from the present research suggest there are clear relationships between (1) feminine identity development and certain cognitive personality variables and (2) feminine identity development and social influence styles.

As hypothesized, the advanced identity statuses generally demonstrated more complex cognitive styles that allowed them to both process large amounts of divergent stimulus information and maintain periods of private reflection of their thoughts and feelings. In their social influence behavior, they generally utilized more direct strategies that required more ego-strength, and they demonstrated a wider repertoire of influence skills. However, when paired with a male partner, the advanced statuses used not only strategies that established them as strong influencers, but also self-abasing and child-like strategies that resembled sex-role stereotypic behaviors of females. These findings lend support to the hypothesis that the advanced statuses demonstrate more complex and differentiated personality functioning, on several cognitive variables and social interaction styles.

However, the similarity of foreclosure and identity achievement women in their interactions with males was striking. These women made more frequent attempts to influence the male confederate and "recovered" with a new attempt much faster, when rejected. These results suggest that a stable identity status is somehow facilitative in male-female relationships. Erikson describes a formed identity as such:

. . . feeling at home in one's body, a sense of 'knowing where one is going,' and a sense of inner assuredness of anticipating recognition from those who count." (Erikson, 1968, p. 165)

Perhaps this sense of assuredness is enabling to women when asserting themselves with a man, and dealing with failures of their attempts with resiliency.

Perhaps the most important findings have to do with the styles of foreclosure women, which, contrary to much of the literature, do not appear very adaptive. The foreclosure women generally demonstrated reduced attentional focus, leading to exclusion of critical information and more frequent errors in judgment. They almost consistently exhibited less desirable influence strategies, that were more indirect and deceptive than the other statuses. While the identity achievement women could incorporate a wide range of strategies, the foreclosure women were far more restricted. These data do not demonstrate the adaptiveness of the foreclosure status, but instead underscore the limitations resulting from restricted self-exploration and premature commitment.

A surprising finding was that personality did not predict social influence behavior. Among psychotherapists, clear relationships between personality characteristics and predictable behavior are often assumed. However, these findings suggest that the way people describe themselves on self-report measures and how they actually behave may have little relationship, especially when their emotions are involved. In contrast, the relationship between identity development, or any kind of development, is often ignored in psychotherapy, especially when dealing with young adults.

It appears that in the psychotherapy of young women, the developmental issues are of critical importance, especially in the current era of sex-role ambivalence. Perhaps, therapists need to pay far more attention to developmental sequences and identify where the client is along developmental hierarchies. Kniefelkamp, Widick, and Stroad (1976) suggest a developmental model of counseling that purports to move the client through developmental stages, to a more "complex view of the world and more integrated and fully developed sense of self" (p. 18). They suggest that:

. . . deliberate efforts are made to cause the client to think increasingly more complexly about herself and her world. The counselor interacts with the client at the stage level she can understand and then provides sufficient cognitive dissonance to cause the client to expand her thought processes. This process known as "plus-one-staging," results in the client moving upward to the next stage of development. Hence, the cognitive-developmental model does not promote adjustment to the status quo, but rather it deliberately seeks to promote greater complexity on the part of the client. (p. 18)

This is an intriguing model to apply to identity development, especially when considering the foreclosure woman who has spent a

good deal of her energies denying divergent options and narrowly focusing her awareness. Likewise, recognizing the inherent internal conflict and role-experimentation of the moratorium, the therapist can assist her to gradually narrow her options on the way to making meaningful commitments. Knowledge of these developmental issues, and the divergent paths one may take towards identity development, are of critical importance in how the therapist perceives and responds to a client's presenting concerns.

In summary, this study makes its contribution to the identity development literature by further exploring the behavioral correlates of the identity statuses and examining the qualitative changes in observable behavior associated with movement towards identity achievement. In addition, the importance of identity development issues in psychotherapy is suggested.

#### Limitations of the Present Research

The sample of college women used as subjects may not be representative of college women in general, since women in this small, rural, conservative community tend to be somewhat homogeneous. In addition, the sample was small and restricted to volunteers, rather than a random selection of subjects. A larger, more heterogeneous sample might have been more realistically representative of college-age women and allow broader generalization of findings.

The social influence situation was admittedly contrived and perhaps too simple to elicit the full range of behaviors that women typically utilize. There was some question, due to the

artificiality of the situation, whether subjects were sufficiently motivated to work hard at influencing the confederate. Also, the effects of social desirability were not controlled for, and this factor may have affected the motivation of the subjects.

As previously mentioned, the attractiveness of the confederate, especially the male, may have mediated social influence behaviors. In future research, more "neutral" confederates might be employed.

### Suggestions for Future Research

The sex differences found in this study raise questions of how a male college student might influence same- versus opposite-sex target persons. A replication of this study with college men is recommended.

Also, the differences found in cognitive styles among the identity statuses, suggest the need for a more comprehensive investigation of performance on a large number of cognitive control dimensions, employing samples of both sexes.

This study addressed styles of influences, but neglected outcome variables. Questions remain as to the effectiveness of the various strategies and the consequences, to both the influencer and target person, of their use. Future research incorporating outcome measures is suggested.

## REFERENCE NOTES

1. Marcia, J.E. Identity text. Book in preparation, 1979.
2. Marcia, J.E. Identity in adolescence. Unpublished paper. Simon Fraser University, 1977.
3. Adams, G.R., & Fitch, S.A. Ego stage and identity status development: An assessment of theoretical change. Manuscript submitted for publication, 1979.
4. Falbo, T., & Peplau, L.A. Sex-role self concept and power in intimate relationships. Paper presented at the 87th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, New York, 1979.
5. Nideffer, R.M. Test of attentional and interpersonal style: Interpretation manual. New York: Behavioral Research Applications Group, 1977.

## REFERENCES

- Adams, G.R., & Shea, J.A. The relationship between identity status, locus of control and ego development. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 1979, 8(1), 81-89.
- Adams, G.R., Shea, J.A., & Fitch, S.A. Toward the development of an objective assessment of ego identity status. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 1979, 8(2), 223-237.
- Bourne, E. The state of research on ego identity: A review and appraisal. Part I. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 1978, 7(3), 223-251. (a)
- Bourne, E. The state of research on ego identity: A review and appraisal. Part II. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 1978, 7(4), 371-392. (b)
- Braginsky, D.D. Machiavellianism and manipulative interpersonal behavior in children. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1970, 6, 77-99.
- Broverman, I.K., Vogel, S.R., Broverman, D.M., Clarkson, F.E., & Rosenkrantz, P.S. Sex-role stereotypes: A current appraisal. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28(2), 59-78.
- Cartwright, D. Power: A neglected variable in social psychology. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), Studies in social power. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research, 1959.
- Doherty, M.A. Sexual bias in personality theory. The Counseling Psychologist, 1976, 6(2), 67-74.
- Donovan, J.M. Identity status and interpersonal style. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 1975, 4, 37-55.
- Douvan, E., & Adelson, J. The Adolescent Experience. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.
- Erikson, E.H. The problem of ego identity. Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association, 1956, 4, 56-121.
- Erikson, E.H. Identity and the life cycle. Psychological Issues, 1959, 1(1).
- Erikson, E.H. Childhood and society (2nd revised ed.). New York: Norton, 1963.
- Erikson, E.H. Identity, youth and crisis. New York: Norton, 1968.



- Falbo, T. Relationships between sex, sex-role and social influence. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 1977, 2, 62-72. (a)
- Falbo, T. Multidimensional scaling of power strategies. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1977, 35(8), 537-548. (b)
- Falbo, T., & Peplau, L.A. Power strategies in intimate relationships. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1980, 38(4), 618-628.
- Gornick, V., & Moran, B. Women in sexist society: Studies in power and powerlessness. New York: Basic Books, 1971.
- Holmes, D.S. Debriefing after psychological experiments: Part II, effectiveness of postexperimental desensitizing. American Psychologist, 1976, 31, 868-875.
- Howard, M.R. Ego identity status in women, fear of success and performance in a competitive situation. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, State University of New York, 1975.
- Johnson, P. Women and power: Toward a theory of effectiveness. Journal of Social Issues, 1976, 32(3), 99-110.
- Johnson, P. Women and interpersonal power. In I.H. Frieze, J.R. Parsons, P. Johnson, D. Ruble, & G. Zellman, Women and sex-roles: A social psychological perspective. New York: W.W. Norton, 1978.
- Josselson, R.L. Psychodynamic aspects of identity formation in college women. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 1973, 2, 3-52.
- Kacerguis, M.A., & Adams, G.R. Erikson stage resolution: The relationship between identity and intimacy. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 1980, 9.
- Kim, J. Factor analysis. In N.H. Nie, C.H. Hull, J.G. Jenkins, K. Steinbrenner, & D.H. Bent, Statistical package for the social sciences (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.
- Klecka, C. Discriminant analysis. In N.H. Nie, C.H. Hull, J.G. Jenkins, K. Steinbrenner, & D.H. Bent, Statistical package for the social sciences (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.
- Knefelkamp, L.L., Widick, C.C., & Stroad, B. Cognitive-developmental theory: A guide to counseling women. The Counseling Psychologist, 1976, 6(2), 15-19.
- Marcia, J.E. Development and validation of ego identity status. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 3(5), 551-558.



- Marcia, J.E. Ego identity status: Relationship to change in self-esteem, "general maladjustment", and authoritarianism. Journal of Personality, 1967, 35(1), 119-133.
- Marcia, J.E. Identity six years after: A follow-up study. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 1976, 5(2), 145-159.
- Marcia, J.E., & Friedman, M.L. Ego identity status in college women. Journal of Personality, 1970, 38(2), 249-263.
- McClelland, D.C. Power: The inner experience. New York: Irvington Publishers, Inc., 1975.
- Morgan, J.R. Personality, sex, setting, and position of factors in interpersonal influence. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1978, 39, 1050-B.
- Nideffer, R.M. Test of attentional and interpersonal style. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 34, 394-405.
- Offer, D., & Offer, J. Profiles of normal adolescent girls. Archives of General Psychiatry, 1968, 19, 513-522.
- Orlofsky, J.L. Intimacy Status: Relationship to interpersonal perception. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 1976, 5, 73-88.
- Orlofsky, J.L. Identity formation, achievement and fear of success in college men and women. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 1978, 7, 49-62.
- Orlofsky, J.L., Marcia, J.E., & Lesser, I.M. Ego identity status and the intimacy versus isolation crisis of adulthood. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 27(2), 211-219.
- Podd, M.H. Ego identity status and morality: The relationship between two developmental constructs. Developmental Psychology, 1972, 6, 497-507.
- Poppen, P.J. The development of sex differences in moral judgment for college males and females. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Cornell University, 1974.
- Prager, K.J. The relationship between identity status, self-esteem and psychological androgyny in college women. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1977, 38, 2347-B.
- Raven, B.H., & Kruglanski, A.W. Conflict and power. In P. Swingle (Ed.), The structure of conflict. New York: Academic Press, 1970.
- Savasta, D.M. The psychology of power: An empirical study of social influence as a function of age, sex, and Machiavellian orientation. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1977.

- Schenkel, S. Relationship among identity status, field-dependence and traditional femininity. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 1975, 4, 73-82.
- Schenkel, S., & Marcia, J.E. Attitudes toward premarital sexual intercourse in determining ego identity status in college women. Journal of Personality, 1972, 3, 472-482.
- Spence, J.T., & Helmrich, R. Who likes competent women? Competence, sex-role congruence of interests and subject's attitude towards women as determinants of interpersonal attraction. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 1972, 2, 197-213.
- Toder, N., & Marcia, J.E. Ego identity status and response to conformity pressure in college women. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 26(2), 287-294.
- Waterman, A.S., Geary, P.S., & Waterman, C.K. Longitudinal study of changes in ego identity status from freshman to senior year in college. Developmental Psychology, 1974, 10, 387-392.
- Waterman, A.S., & Goldman, J.A. A longitudinal study of ego identity development at a liberal arts college. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 1976, 5(4), 361-369.
- Waterman, C.K., Beubel, M., & Waterman, A.S. The relationship between resolution of the identity crisis and outcomes of previous psychological crises. Proceedings of the 78th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, 1970, 5, 467-468.
- Waterman, C.K., & Waterman, A.S. Ego identity status and decision styles. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 1974, 3, 1-6.

## APPENDICES

Appendix AConsent Form

Utah State University  
Department of Psychology  
College of Education

Investigation of Interpersonal  
Verbal Behaviors

I hereby give my consent to participate in this study of interpersonal verbal behaviors. I understand that any identifying information about me will be held in confidence by the experimenter and will be destroyed upon the completion of the research. A summary of the results of this investigation will be made available to me from the Psychology Department secretary by August 15, 1980. I have been informed of the nature of the study and understand that I am free to withdraw my consent to participate at any time.

Signature\_\_\_\_\_

Date\_\_\_\_\_

Experimenter\_\_\_\_\_

Date\_\_\_\_\_

## Appendix B

### The Objective Measure of Ego Identity Status

Name:

Age:

Phone #:

State of birth:

Best time to call me:

Major:

Instructions: Read each item and indicate to what degree it fits your own impressions as to how it best reflects your thoughts and feelings. Circle only one.

1. I haven't really considered politics. They just don't excite me much.

Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Agree	Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---------------------	-------	----------	------------------------	----------------------

2. I might have thought about a lot of different things but there's never really been a decision since my parents said what they wanted.

Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Agree	Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---------------------	-------	----------	------------------------	----------------------

3. When it comes to religion I just haven't found any that I'm really into myself.

Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Agree	Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---------------------	-------	----------	------------------------	----------------------

4. My parents had it decided a long time ago what I should go into and I'm following their plans.

Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Agree	Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---------------------	-------	----------	------------------------	----------------------

5. There are so many different political parties and ideals. I can't decide which to follow until I figure it all out.

Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Agree	Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---------------------	-------	----------	------------------------	----------------------

6. I don't give religion much thought and it doesn't bother me one way or the other.

Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Agree	Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---------------------	-------	----------	------------------------	----------------------

7. I guess I'm pretty much like my folks when it comes to politics. I follow what they do in terms of voting and such.

Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Agree	Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---------------------	-------	----------	------------------------	----------------------

8. I haven't chosen the occupation I really want to get into, but I'm working toward becoming a \_\_\_\_\_ until something better comes along.

Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Agree	Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---------------------	-------	----------	------------------------	----------------------

-2-

9. A person's faith is unique to each individual. I've considered and reconsidered it myself and know what I can believe.

Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Agree	Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---------------------	-------	----------	------------------------	----------------------

10. It took me a long time to decide but now I know for sure what direction to move in for a career.

Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Agree	Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---------------------	-------	----------	------------------------	----------------------

11. I really never was involved in politics enough to have to make a firm stand one way or the other.

Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Agree	Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---------------------	-------	----------	------------------------	----------------------

12. I'm not so sure what religion means to me. I'd like to make up my mind but I'm not done looking yet.

Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Agree	Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---------------------	-------	----------	------------------------	----------------------

13. I've thought my political beliefs through and realize I may or may not agree with many of my parent's beliefs.

Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Agree	Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---------------------	-------	----------	------------------------	----------------------

14. It took me a while to figure it out, but now I really know what I want for a career.

Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Agree	Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---------------------	-------	----------	------------------------	----------------------

15. Religion is confusing to me right now. I keep changing my views on what is right and wrong to me.

Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Agree	Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---------------------	-------	----------	------------------------	----------------------

16. I'm sure it will be pretty easy for me to change my occupational goals when something better comes along.

Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Agree	Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---------------------	-------	----------	------------------------	----------------------

17. My folks have always had their own political and moral beliefs about issues like abortion and mercy killing and I've always gone along accepting what they have.

Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Agree	Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---------------------	-------	----------	------------------------	----------------------

-3-

18. I've gone through a period of serious questioning about faith and can now say I understand what I believe in as an individual.
- |                |                  |       |          |                     |                   |
|----------------|------------------|-------|----------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Strongly Agree | Moderately Agree | Agree | Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|----------------|------------------|-------|----------|---------------------|-------------------|
19. I'm not sure about my political beliefs, but I'm trying to figure out what I can truly believe in.
- |                |                  |       |          |                     |                   |
|----------------|------------------|-------|----------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Strongly Agree | Moderately Agree | Agree | Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|----------------|------------------|-------|----------|---------------------|-------------------|
20. I just can't decide how capable I am as a person and what jobs I'll be right for.
- |                |                  |       |          |                     |                   |
|----------------|------------------|-------|----------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Strongly Agree | Moderately Agree | Agree | Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|----------------|------------------|-------|----------|---------------------|-------------------|
21. I attend the same church as my family has always attended. I've never really questioned why.
- |                |                  |       |          |                     |                   |
|----------------|------------------|-------|----------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Strongly Agree | Moderately Agree | Agree | Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|----------------|------------------|-------|----------|---------------------|-------------------|
22. I just can't decide what to do for an occupation. There are so many that have possibilities.
- |                |                  |       |          |                     |                   |
|----------------|------------------|-------|----------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Strongly Agree | Moderately Agree | Agree | Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|----------------|------------------|-------|----------|---------------------|-------------------|
23. I've never really questioned my religion. If it's right for my parents it must be right for me.
- |                |                  |       |          |                     |                   |
|----------------|------------------|-------|----------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Strongly Agree | Moderately Agree | Agree | Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|----------------|------------------|-------|----------|---------------------|-------------------|
24. Politics are something that I can never be too sure about because things change so fast. But I do think it's important to know what I believe in.
- |                |                  |       |          |                     |                   |
|----------------|------------------|-------|----------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Strongly Agree | Moderately Agree | Agree | Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|----------------|------------------|-------|----------|---------------------|-------------------|

PLEASE NOTE:

Copyrighted materials in this document have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, in the author's university library.

These consist of pages:

Test of Attentional and Interpersonal Style

Pages 113 through 119.

Social Interaction Scoring System Manual (Revised)

Pages 120 through 137.

University  
Microfilms  
International

300 N. ZEEB RD., ANN ARBOR, MI 48106 (313) 761-4700



Appendix CTest of Attentional and Interpersonal Style

## INSTRUCTIONS

**USE NO. 2 PENCIL    DO NOT WRITE ON THE TEST BOOKLET**

Read each item carefully and then answer according to the frequency with which it describes you or your behavior. For example, item 1 is "When people talk to me, I find myself distracted by the sights and sounds around me."

A = NEVER  
B = RARELY  
C = SOMETIMES  
D = FREQUENTLY  
E = ALWAYS

If your answer to the first item is SOMETIMES, you would mark with a No. 2 pencil under C for item number 1. The same key is used for every item, thus each time you mark an A you are indicating NEVER, etc.

1. Please be sure to mark your name in the spaces provided at the right of the answer sheet.
2. Fill in your date of birth in the spaces provided at the bottom of the answer sheet.
3. Indicate your sex in the space provided.
4. At the bottom of the answer sheet under Grade, please indicate the number of years of schooling you have completed.

*Distributed by:*

*Behavioral Research Applications Group, Inc.*

19 CAMBRIDGE ST.

ROCHESTER, NEW YORK 14607

75 PERKELL PLACE

KITCHENER, ONTARIO

1. When people talk to me I find myself distracted by the sights and sounds around me.
2. When people talk to me I find myself distracted by my own thoughts and ideas.
3. All I need is a little information and I can come up with a large number of ideas.
4. My thoughts are limited to the objects and people in my immediate surroundings.
5. I need to have all the information before I say or do anything.
6. The work I do is focused and narrow, proceeding in a logical fashion.
7. I run back and forth from task to task.
8. I seem to work in "fits and starts" or "bits and pieces".
9. The work I do involves a wide variety of seemingly unrelated material and ideas.
10. My thoughts and associations come so rapidly I can't keep up with them.
11. The world seems to be a booming buzzing brilliant flash of color and confusion.
12. When I make a mistake it is because I did not wait to get all of the information.
13. When I make a mistake it is because I waited too long and got too much information.
14. When I read it is easy to block out everything but the book.
15. I focus on one small part of what a person says and miss the total message.
16. In school I failed to wait for the teachers' instructions.
17. I have difficulty clearing my mind of a single thought or idea.
18. I think about one thing at a time.
19. I get caught up in my thoughts and become oblivious to what is going on around me.
20. I theorize and philosophize.
21. I enjoy quiet, thoughtful times.
22. I would rather be feeling and experiencing the world than my own thoughts.
23. My environment is exciting and keeps me involved.
24. My interests are broader than most people's.
25. My interests are narrower than most people's.
26. It is easy for me to direct my attention and focus narrowly on something.

27. It is easy for me to focus on a number of things at the same time.
28. It is easy for me to keep thoughts from interfering with something I am watching or listening to.
29. It is easy for me to keep sights and sounds from interfering with my thoughts.
30. Happenings or objects grab my attention.
31. It is easy for me to keep my mind on a single thought or idea.
32. I am good at picking a voice or instrument out of a piece of music that I am listening to.
33. With so much going on around me, it's difficult for me to think about anything for any length of time.
34. I am good at quickly analyzing complex situations around me, such as how a play is developing in football or which of four or five kids started a fight.
35. At stores I am faced with so many choices I can't make up my mind.
36. I spend a great deal of my time thinking about all kinds of ideas I have.
37. I figure out how to respond to others by imagining myself in their situation.
38. In school I would become distracted and didn't stick to the subject.
39. When I get anxious or nervous my attention becomes narrow and I fail to see important things that are going on around me.
40. Even though I am not hungry, if something I like is placed in front of me, I'll eat it.
41. I am more of a doing kind of person than a thinking one.
42. In a room filled with children or out on a playing field, I know what everyone is doing.
43. It is easy for me to keep my mind on a single sight or sound.
44. I am good at rapidly scanning crowds and picking out a particular person or face.
45. I have difficulty shifting back and forth from one conversation to another.
46. I get confused trying to watch activities such as a football game or circus where a number of things are happening at the same time.
47. I have so many things on my mind that I become confused and forgetful.
48. On essay tests my answers are (were) too narrow and don't cover the topic.
49. It is easy for me to forget about problems by watching a good movie or by listening to music.

50. I can't resist temptation when it is right in front of me.
51. In games I make mistakes because I am watching what one person does and forget about the others.
52. I can plan several moves ahead in complicated games like bridge and chess.
53. In school I was not a "thinker".
54. In a roomful of people I can keep track of several conversations at the same time.
55. I have difficulty telling how others feel by watching them and listening to them talk.
56. People have to repeat things to me because I become distracted by irrelevant sights or sounds around me.
57. I make mistakes because I try to do too many things at once.
58. I am good at analyzing situations and predicting in advance what others will do.
59. On essay tests my answers are (were) too broad, bringing in irrelevant information.
60. People fool me because I don't bother to analyze the things that they say; I take them at face value.
61. I would much rather be doing something than just sitting around thinking.
62. I make mistakes because my thoughts get stuck on one idea or feeling.
63. I am constantly analyzing people and situations.
64. I get confused at busy intersections.
65. I am good at glancing at a large area and quickly picking out several objects, such as in those hidden figure drawings in children's magazines.
66. I get anxious and block out everything on tests.
67. Even when I am involved in a game or sport, my mind is going a mile a minute.
68. I can figure out how to respond to others just by looking at them.
69. I have a tendency to get involved in a conversation and forget important things like a pot on the stove, or like leaving the motor running on the car.
70. It is easy for me to bring together ideas from a number of different areas.
71. Sometimes lights and sounds come at me so rapidly they make me lightheaded or dizzy.
72. People have to repeat things because I get distracted by my own irrelevant thoughts.

73. People pull the wool over my eyes because I fail to see when they are obviously kidding by looking at the way they are smiling or listening to their joking tone.
74. I can spend a lot of time just looking at things with my mind almost a complete blank except for reflecting the things that I see.
75. I sometimes confuse others because I tell them too many things at once.
76. I engage in physical activity.
77. People describe me as serious.
78. I sit alone listening to music.
79. People take advantage of me.
80. I keep my thoughts to myself.
81. I keep my feelings to myself.
82. I am good at getting my own way.
83. I like to argue.
84. Others see me as a loner.
85. I talked a lot in class when I was in school.
86. I enjoy intellectual competition with others.
87. I enjoy individual athletic competition.
88. I compete(d) athletically.
89. I physically express my feelings of affection.
90. I compete with myself intellectually.
91. I compete with myself physically.
92. I enjoy activities with danger or an element of the unknown in them.
93. I express my opinions on issues.
94. I can keep a secret.
95. When I believe deeply in something I find I am a poor loser and unable to compromise.
96. I am socially self-confident when interacting with those who are like myself.
97. I am socially self-confident when interacting with authority figures.

98. I am socially self-confident when talking in front of large groups.
99. I am socially self-confident when talking with the opposite sex.
100. I express my anger.
101. I dated in high school.
102. People think I am a clown.
103. I get mad and express it.
104. I get down on myself.
105. I was one of the smartest kids in school.
106. I am a good person.
107. My feelings are intense.
108. I need to help others.
109. I need to be liked.
110. I enjoy planning for the future.
111. I wish I lived in a different time.
112. I feel guilty.
113. I feel ashamed.
114. I am seen as a cold person by others.
115. I am a good mixer.
116. I am socially outgoing.
117. I have difficulty waiting for good things to happen.
118. I peeked at Christmas time.
119. When I am angry I lose control and say things that sometimes hurt others.
120. I have been angry enough that I physically hurt someone.
121. At dances or parties I find a corner and avoid the limelight.
122. I acted in dramatic productions in high school and/or college.
123. In school the kids I hung around with were athletes.

124. In school the kids I hung around with were intellectuals.
125. In school the kids I hung around with were popular.
126. In school the kids I hung around with were outcasts or loners.
127. People trust me with their secrets.
128. I am in control in interpersonal situations.
129. I fought in school.
130. I have used illegal drugs.
131. In groups I am one of the leaders.
132. People admire me for my intellect.
133. People admire me for my physical ability.
134. People admire me for my concern for others.
135. People admire me for my social status.
136. I ran for class offices in school.
137. I feel as though I am a burden to others.
138. People see me as an angry person.
139. I see myself as an angry person.
140. I have a lot of energy for my age.
141. I am always on the go.
142. I cut school in high school.
143. I have engaged in activities that could get me in trouble with the police.
144. I guess you could call me a poor loser.

## Appendix D

### Social Interaction Scoring System Manual (Revised)

The social influence behaviors in this scoring system have been clustered into 15 major categories. The criteria for inclusion into each category are listed below with examples. The following scoring procedures were used in order to improve interrater consensus.

1. Audio tapes of the social influence situation were transcribed.
2. Before sitting down to score, each rater read over the entire scoring system in order to warm up.
3. Scoring was done while reading the transcriptions and listening to the tapes. Only one page at a time was scored after listening to that section of the tape, in order to emphasize voice inflections.
4. Each sentence was scored as a separate statement, unless it's meaning was unmistakably determined by a previous statement.
5. These procedures were followed until the judges consistently achieved 85% agreement on sample protocols. The judges then blindly scored the 80 protocols from the treatment group, from which 30 were randomly chosen for a reliability check.

### Image Control

#### 1. Verbal Ascendancy-Dominance

A strategy should be scored as ascendancy-dominance when it is of such strength that it does not imply autonomy, choice or



non-compliance on the part of the other. A verb or a verb phrase will generally begin the main portion of the statement. In this category, the influencer makes it explicit what the other is to do by: self righteousness and superiority of self over other; demands, directive comments implying no autonomy for the other; orders; commands; bossing; giving explicit instructions, asserting one's own authority.

The influencer interrupts or "overtalks" (increased volume or overlap of statements) the other as a sign of ascendancy.

Important in this category is the tone of voice or emphasis with which the statement is issued. Commands are scored in this category even if softened by "okay?" The tone overrides the content of the statement.

Examples:

"Eat!"  
 "Here, have a brown one."  
 "Help yourself."  
 "Take some home."  
 "Try it!"  
 "Eat some!"  
 "Okay, now start eating the M&M's and I'll count them."  
 "I want you to stuff them all in your mouth!"

Exceptions: Directive comments issued with a pleading tone are scored 6a.

## 2. Physical Ascendancy-Dominance

This category includes all verbal statements of physical dominance or superiority. This includes threats of physical punishment and reminders of physical strength.

Examples:

"Remember, I'm bigger than you are."

"If you don't eat them, I'm going to feed them to you!"

"I'm going to shove them in your mouth. Here, open up!"

"I'm just asking you, will you eat the M&M's? Or I'll beat your face in."

"You want me to feed you, here!"

### 3. Provides Positive Structure

The criteria for inclusion in this category are as follows:

- a. Gives suggestions for organization, procedures, orientation, solution to the problem. Also included in this category is providing information about the task of eating M&M's. The influencer performs actions towards organizing for attaining her goal or makes procedural suggestions of a normative nature, directed towards some immediate action. This includes the influencer eating M&M's if accompanied by verbalizations indicating that she is doing so. Score 3a if the influencer follows a true statement with an emphasis or a clarification phrase, such as "seriously" or "no joke."

Examples:

"You can have them all."

"Why don't you try just one."

"I like to eat M&M's whenever I can."

"I guess I'll just have some of these myself."

"Please feel free to eat as many of those as you like."

"They're here for us to enjoy."

"I'm going to eat more of these and try to persuade you."

"I'm not supposed to eat them, you are."

"Don't be shy, have more than one."

- b. Gives opinion, evaluation, analysis or expression of feeling or wish. These are general evaluative or opinion-expressing comments of the influencer, generally in the form of drawing a conclusion or expressing opinions that lead to influencing

the other. Any opinions about candy or about eating the candy belong in this category. A distinction should be made between statements of opinion and deceptive statements.

Examples:

"I hope you aren't on a diet."  
 "They're really good."  
 "There's nothing wrong with them."  
 "One is not very many."  
 "I wish you would eat more of them."  
 "They do psychological studies of strange things."

Exceptions: Deceptive statements ("They don't have any calories.") will be scored 13a.

- c. Gives agreement or concurrence. This category includes all items which indicate agreement with the other, voting to accept a decision, indicating that the other is correct in her assertion, or indicating that the assertion is correct. Distinction should be made between giving agreement and submitting or complying.

Examples:

"That sounds right to me."  
 (I like the green ones best) "I do, too."  
 "I agree."  
 (They taste good) "I know."  
 (This is weird) "It sure is!"

Exceptions: Statements implying submission ("Okay, but I just thought that you might want some.") are scored 7.

- d. Draws attention, repeats, clarifies. The influencer draws attention to the problem, statement or the person about to make the statement. Also scored here are: clarifications of the meaning of a previous comment, returning the other's attention to the task after having clearly been on a tangent,

maintaining attention on the task such as talking about M&M's and repeating because the other didn't hear or asks for repetition.

Examples:

"Here. Do you see this candy?"  
 "I'll tell you what . . . ."  
 (What did you say?) "I said that you should eat them."  
 "I'll come right to the point."  
 (I could be rich when I walk out of here.) "Well,  
     comparatively, to right now, which is broke."  
 "No, I am just teasing."

4. Provides Negative Structure

- a. All contradictions are included in this category. The influencer gives disagreement, maintains contrary position. Influencer disagrees with the content of the statement or position of the other. This category includes refusal to eat M&M's, resistance to suggestions, opinions or alternatives offered by the other, direct contradictions and disagreeing that is not hostile/antagonistic.

Examples:

"I don't want any."  
 "I can't eat them because I am on a diet."  
 "I've had so many that I can't eat any more."  
 (You have some) "No."  
 (I don't want any more) "Yes, you do."

- b. Negative Exclamations. This category is reserved for negative exclamations that have no relevant meaning. If there is a hostile note to the statement, the item is scored 8a.

Examples:

"Oh, my God!"

"Shut"

"Goll"

"One M&M"

"Is that all?"

Exceptions: If there is a hostile note to the statement, the item is scored 8a.

5. Asks for Structure

The criteria for inclusion in this category are follows:

- a. Asks for opinions, affective evaluations, analysis or expression of wish or feeling, including opinions about M&M's. The definitions for category 3b holds here except that the influencer is asking for the other's opinions, evaluations, analysis and expressions rather than giving these statements.

Examples:

"What do you think about this?"

"Tell me how you feel about doing this."

"I wish you'd give me your thoughts."

"Do you think they're good?"

"Do you like M&M's?"

"They're kind of tempting, aren't they?"

"Do you feel weird here with a stranger?"

"Okay?"

- Exceptions:
1. Asking for structure out of personal inadequacy is scored 6b.  
"Do you think I'm weird?"
  2. Asking for structure implying inter-dependency is scored 10.  
"Do you think we could both finish off this bowl?"
  3. Asking for structure which implies suspicion is scored 8c.  
"Do you think anyone is watching us from behind that window?"

- b. Asks for solution, direction, possible ways of action, orientation or information. Influencer asks for direction, solutions or procedural suggestions regarding the eating of the M&M's. Includes all requests to eat the M&M's. The influencer solicits information or confirmation from the other.

Examples:

"Do you want some M&M's?"  
 "Are you sure you don't want any more?"  
 "How did you get chosen to do this?"  
 "How could I get you to do this?"  
 "Are you sure?"  
 "Are you going to eat any more of these?"  
 "Is there anything I could do to get you to eat these?"  
 "So, do you want to eat?"  
 "Do you want a brown one?"

Exceptions: 1. Asking for solutions, etc., that implies interdependency is scored 10.  
 "If I split the money with you, will you eat these?"  
 2. Asking for motives or questions that imply suspicion are scored 8c.  
 "Why aren't you eating these?"  
 "Did she tell you not to eat any?"

- c. Asks for repetition or clarification. This category is the same as 3d, except that the influencer is asking the other for the repetition, clarification or redirection of attention.

If the tone has a pleading quality, the statement is scored 6a.

Examples:

"What do you mean by that?"  
 "What?"  
 "What did you say just then?"  
 ("Do you like this candy?" Yes.) "Really?"  
 "Huh?" (What did you say?)

## 6. Abasement

Criteria for inclusion in this category are as follows:

### a. Supplicates, asks for succorance, implores, entreats, begs.

The influencer entreats, begs humbly, implores, asks the permission of the other, pleads or appeals to the other for help. The meta-content in terms of intonation is very critical in this category. The tone could be characterized as any one of these: childlike, crying, begging or whining. All "come on" statements belong in this category unless the tone is definitely a command.

#### Examples:

"Come on!"  
 "Please!"  
 "Why not?"  
 "Please, do it just for me."  
 "You've got to do this for me!"  
 "I'm begging you!"  
 "Please, eat them."  
 "Won't you eat some, please?"

### b. Blames or belittles the self, asks for help by virtue of inadequacy. The influencer's requests for assistance carry connotations of inadequacy of a personal nature. This category includes statements of self-blame and derogation and strong statement of self-doubt.

#### Examples:

"I feel so weird doing this!"  
 "I feel silly sitting here eating these all by myself."  
 "I'll bet others did this better than me."  
 "I'm really not very persuasive, am I?"  
 "I don't know. . ."  
 "Well. . ."  
 "I'm embarrassed."  
 "I don't know what to say."

"I've never been one to try to be first."

"You try to talk seriously and all I can do is talk about M&M's."

"I'm such a munch gut!"

"Do you think that I'm weird for offering you all this candy?"

## 7. Submission-Compliance

The influencer exhibits behavior which the other requests, an indication that she will comply with behavior requested of her. A response is scored compliance of the behavior of the target person if the behavior is exhibited or agreed to. A response is scored submission-compliance if when the target person refuses candy, the influencer makes no further attempts or complies for even a short time.

### Examples:

(I don't feel like eating any.) "Okay."

(Let's not do this anymore.) "Okay."

"I'll give you 5¢ to eat each M&M." (No. 25¢) "How about 10¢?"  
(No. 25¢) "Okay, okay. 25¢."

### Sanctions Control

## 8. Negative Sanctions

Negative sanctions imply an active negative evaluation of the target person. Criteria for inclusion in this category are as follows:

- a. Verbal antagonism, hostility, aggression, disapproval. This category includes a wide variety of verbal behaviors which are either socially or psychologically destructive to the other or his/her position. The statements are delivered personally and aggressively. The following behaviors are included: ad hominum attacks or arguments about the other's



character to discredit him/her; suggestions implying that the other has no reasonable grounds on which to stand; personal negativism; harassing or taking advantage of the other, even if cloaked in humor; confrontation or challenge done in an aggressive fashion; personal rejection; sarcastic, bitter or cutting remarks, ridicule; making fun of; blaming the other for the influencer's failures to convince. Attempts to make the other person feel guilty are included here.

Examples:

"Just eat it you idiot!"

"What's the matter with you? Are you afraid to try it?"

"So what if you gain a few pounds!"

"You're the one who is losing out, you know."

Listen for tones with statements such as:

"Boy, if it was me, I'd eat them." (put-down)

"Do I have to eat all these myself?"

"Is that all you're going to have?"

"That's okay. It doesn't bother me if you don't want any." (guilt)

"My, my. How polite!" (sarcasm)

"Oh, I wouldn't want you to feel bad." (guilt)

"Go ahead and be like that. I don't care!" (sarcasm and guilt)

- b. Excludes or Withdraws. This behavior is less direct than the verbal antagonism mentioned above, but is nonetheless an expression of negative affect. This category involves verbally moving away or withdrawing from the other: ignoring what the other says, avoiding talking with the other, and statements implying exclusion of the other, including silences of 10 seconds or more.

- c. Suspicion, questioning motives. This category includes any form of suspicion manifested by the influencer, such as: asking about target person's motives, asking what the other wants in return for the behavior requested, trying to find out why the other is so nice. Any question that asks, in essence, "Why aren't you eating these?" This category includes any suspicious behavior directed toward the examiner.

Examples:

"Did she tell you not to eat any?"  
 "I think you've been told ahead of time."  
 "Did you know about this before today?"  
 "Are you on a diet?"  
 "Don't you like chocolate?"  
 "Why don't you want anymore?"  
 "Are you sick?"  
 "You just don't like M&M's?"  
 "Any particular reason why you don't want some?"  
 "Why are you here?" (suspicion)  
 "What did she tell you?" (suspicion)

- d. Redirected Aggression. This category includes negative aggressive expressions directed towards the external situation or the experimenter. This would include all aggression, hostility, etc. directed out of the field, negative feelings expressed towards a third person outside the dyad, hostile jokes and aggression toward objects.

Examples:

"This is really weird."  
 "I feel like I'm on a dating show!"  
 "Doris, get me out of here!"  
 "They put you in this room and make you feel weird."  
 "This puts you on a level of being really stupid."  
 "I'd expect them to make us do something like this."  
 "Goll, this is so stupid!"

## 9. Positive Sanctions

These behaviors imply positive evaluation of some behavior or interaction within the observational field, regardless of whether the referent is the self or the other. These are supportive acts; they are assertive supportive acts which imply initiative beyond mere responsiveness.

- a. Shows affection, acceptance, attention or approval. This category includes: expressions of sympathy; concerned or solicitous behavior toward the other; supportive positive nurturance; instrumental and emotional support; offers of assistance; appreciation, praises, encourages or compliments; feels good and says so; tries to cheer up the other; recognizes resourcefulness of other in an area of skill or knowledge.

### Examples:

"You must have a lot of self-control."  
 "I was going to tell you that you didn't need to be on a diet if you are."  
 "You're doing really well!"  
 "I hope you don't feel too funny doing this."  
 "I'm glad I'm not in your place. It's hard to just sit there."  
 "That's really a nice necklace."  
 (It looks like the cameras are on) "Don't worry, they aren't on. It's okay."

- b. Raising the status of the other. The influencer deliberately attempts or effectively raises or enhances the status of the other. This can be done through individual praise or acceptance of the other, buttering up or casting the other in a positive light, flattering or ingratiation. If this is done with "we", then it is scored interdependency, 10.

Examples:

"You're really a big guy, big muscles. You should be able to eat a lot of these."  
 "I wish I could phrase it as well as you have."  
 "You certainly have an excellent point there."  
 "You're so smart!"  
 "You must know a lot about psychology, being a senior and all."  
 "You're so sweet, but you won't do it?"

Exceptions: Flattering or ingratiation done with a "we" are scored 10.

Resource Control10. Interdependency Strategies

Interdependency implies working together for the benefit of both parties. Criteria for inclusion in this category are as follows: Compromise, combining purposes, cooperation, equal distribution of advantages and disadvantages. This category includes: offers of working together in a more collaborative way; coordinating activities to alleviate any conflict that may exist; appeals to distributive justice or fairness to deal with the situation; coordination of activities to assist one another; suggestions for reciprocal exchange. This category also includes joint operation or action which fairly and equally distributes the advantages and disadvantages of the situation.

Examples:

"I get 50¢ for every M&M you eat. If you eat some, I'll give you half the money."  
 "I'll split the money with you. You shouldn't get a raw deal."  
 "I'll eat one for every one you eat."  
 "We'll each eat half and each get half of the money."  
 "If I eat one, will you?"

Exceptions: "I'll give you 50¢ if you eat them all." is scored 11, since no combining of resources is indicated.

## 11. Resource Management

The influencer uses her resources as part of the influence attempt, with no attempt to deceive or exploit the other.

- a. Depriving of resources. This includes depriving the other of resources, privileges, advantages or help. A resource is something which the influencer believes the other person wants.

### Examples:

"If you don't eat them, I'll never speak to you again."

"I'm not going to share the money with you."

"If you don't eat them, I won't tell you what this experiment is all about."

"I'm not going to help you eat them."

Exceptions: If the response includes an obvious lie, then score 13, Deception.

- b. Offering of Resources. The behaviors observed in this category include: giving tangible objects such as gifts, goods, money, information, giving intangible objects such as promises of events, errands, etc., bargaining with resources in a non-reciprocal way.

### Examples:

"I'll give you 50¢ an M&M."

"If you eat one, I'll tell you what this is all about."

"If you'll eat them, I'll give you a kiss for each one."

"Here, would you like a mint? I'll give you one for each M&M you eat."

"I'll tell you what this is about. Eat some of these first."

## Perception Control

### 12. Explanation

This category, explanation, implies straightforward and accurate descriptions of the experimental parameters in order to influence the target person to eat candy. The descriptions are an accurate version of what the subject was told by the experimenter at the beginning of the session, although it need not be lengthy or complete. The subject is attempting to present an undistorted picture of reality as she sees it.

#### Examples:

"I'm supposed to get you to eat these."

"I'm getting judged on persuasiveness according to how many of these I can get you to eat."

"They are going to pay me 50¢ for every one of these you eat, so I'd like you to eat as many of these as you can."

"They came into my class and gave a survey test and called me up to come in here. That's how I got chosen."

"These are here for you to eat."

"This study is about how women convince other people to do things."

"I'm trying to get you to eat as many of these as you can in three minutes."

"She said she would come back in three minutes."

"She called me up last night and asked me to come in."

"She said they're there for us to eat."

### 13. Deception

Deception implies conscious attempts to distort the perceptions of the other. Criteria for inclusion are:

- a. Commissive Lying. This category includes distortion or creation of new information presented to the other. Commissive lies need not follow a question from the other to be scorable. Commissive lies may relate to the motives the influencer communicates to the other, the benefits she

may receive from the requested behaviors, the cost of inducing the behavior of the other or any other statements that keep the other in the dark. This category also includes comments such as "honest" or "seriously" when following a lie, and are scored as a separate response.

Examples:

"Trust me." (following a lie)  
 "Candy is nutritious."  
 "They're calorie-free."  
 "I ate a lot of candy before you came in."  
 "Orange ones make you sexy."  
 "She didn't tell me why we're doing this."  
 "I won't have to work this summer, if you just eat all these candies."  
 (Do you know what's going on?) "No, I don't know anything at all."  
 "Here, eat these so I can perform a test on your metabolic rate."

Exceptions: "They give you energy" or any such true statement is scored 3a.

- b. Omissive Lying. This category of manipulative behavior is defined as the selective disclosure or omission of information. However, because there is no check in the experiment of Ss retention of information it would be difficult to differentiate between deceit and unintentional failure to provide information. Therefore, omissive lies will be scored only after the other requests information of the influencer and the influencer evades, ignores or simply does not furnish the other with the requested information. Omissive lies must be preceded by a question. Multiple lies may be scored following one question.

Examples:

(How many of these candies must I eat?) "I don't know."  
 (Are the candies plain or peanut M&M's?) "Have some candy."  
 (Why are we doing this? Do you know what this is all about?) "Well no, not really."

14. Manipulation

- a. Two-sided Arguments. The influencer presents not only the positive aspects of the task, but also the negative in an attempt to influence the other.

Examples:

"They are fattening, but think how good they'll taste."  
 "They're not so good for you, but they're free!"  
 "Even though you're full after lunch, you can think of these as dessert. Free dessert!"  
 "They give you zits, but they taste good."

- b. Attribution of Responsibility to the Experimenter. In this influence strategy, the subject denies her responsibility for her behavior and shifts it to the experimenter. Whenever the influencer refers to the experimenter as part of her plea to get the other to eat an M&M, it is counted as attribution of responsibility. This category includes responses which say, in essence, "She wants you to eat them and I don't really care."

Examples:

"She says you should eat the M&M's."  
 "I don't really care, but she wants you to do it for the experiment."  
 "She said you have to eat them all."



Exceptions: There are times when explanations will necessitate the use of "she". If these are descriptive and accurate statements, as opposed to denial of responsibility, then they are scored 12.

"She said we would be in here for three minutes."

"She said this was an experiment about how people influence other people."

"She said you were chosen from a class and were in the next room taking tests."

15. Other

This category includes influence attempts which do not fit into any other category.

Appendix E

Subject # \_\_\_\_\_

Scoring Summary Sheet

	<u>tally</u>	<u>final</u>
<u>Image Control: Assertive-Yielding Behaviors</u>		
1. Verbal Ascendency-Dominance	_____	_____
2. Physical Ascendency-Dominance	_____	_____
3. Positive Structure Provided	_____	_____
a. Suggestions and actions towards goals	.....	
b. Opinions and evaluations	.....	
c. Agreements and concurrence	.....	
d. Draws attention, repeats clarifies	.....	
4. Negative Structure Provided	_____	_____
a. Disagreements	.....	
b. Negative exclamations	.....	
5. Asks for Structure	_____	_____
a. Asks for opinions and evaluations	.....	
b. Asks for suggestions, actions toward goals	.....	
c. Asks for repetition, clarification	.....	
6. Abasement	_____	_____
a. Pleads, implores, begs	.....	
b. Blames and belittles self	.....	
7. Submission-Compliance	_____	_____
<u>Sanctions Control: Positive and Negative Affect Behaviors</u>		
8. Negative Sanctions	_____	_____
a. Verbal antagonism, hostility, guilt induction	.....	
b. Exclusion or withdrawal	.....	
c. Suspicion or questioning motives	.....	
d. Redirected aggression	.....	

## 9. Positive Sanctions

- |                                    |       |       |
|------------------------------------|-------|-------|
|                                    | _____ | _____ |
| a. Affection, acceptance, approval | ..... |       |
| b. Raising the status of the other | ..... |       |

Resource Control: Interdependency Behaviors

## 10. Interdependency Strategies

## 11. Resource Management

- |                           |       |       |
|---------------------------|-------|-------|
|                           | _____ | _____ |
| a. Depriving of resources | ..... |       |
| b. Offering of resources  | ..... |       |

Perception Control: Presentation of Information about Reality

## 12. Explanation

## 13. Deception

- |                     |       |       |
|---------------------|-------|-------|
|                     | _____ | _____ |
| a. Commissive Lying | ..... |       |
| b. Omissive Lying   | ..... |       |

## 14. Manipulation

- |   |       |       |
|---|-------|-------|
|   | _____ | _____ |
| a. Money-Split Bribe                                | ..... |       |
| b. Two-Sided Arguments                              | ..... |       |
| c. Attribution of Responsibility to<br>Experimenter | ..... |       |

## 15. Other

Latency time \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Appendix FPost Experimental Questionnaire

1. How motivated were you to get your partner to eat the M&M's?

1        2        3        4        5        6        7        8        9

Highly  
Unmotivated

Average

Highly  
Motivated

2. How warm and friendly was your partner during the time you were trying to get her/him to eat the candy?

1        2        3        4        5        6        7        8        9

Highly  
Unmotivated

Average

Highly  
Motivated

3. Would you participate in another study like this one again, if asked?

No

Maybe

Yes

Thank you!

## VITA

November 4, 1947--Born, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

1969--B.S., Pennsylvania State University, State College, Pennsylvania

1972--M.Ed., The University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu, Hawaii

1972-1975--Psychology Technician, Department of Army, Ft. Shafter,  
Hawaii

1975-1978--Psychology Technician, Veterans Administration, Honolulu,  
Hawaii

1978--Teaching Assistant, Educational Psychology, Utah State  
University, Logan, Utah

1979--Teaching Assistant, Research Methods, Utah State University,  
Logan, Utah

1980--Graduate Assistant, Counseling and Testing Center, Utah State  
University, Logan, Utah

1981--Psychology Intern, Program in Health Care Psychology, University  
of Minnesota Health Sciences Center, Minneapolis, Minnesota

1981-82--Staff Psychologist, Department of Pediatric Neurology and  
Department of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, University of  
Minnesota Health Sciences Center, Minneapolis, Minnesota